



Cavemen drew better than us, but was Neanderthal Bug eyed? And do Hobbits' tiny teeth tell tales as 'Susan says silly Steven spent sixpence suddenly', but apes brains can't, while John Mackay gets the treatment in the first chapter of the new book 'HERETICS' - by award winning Journalist Will Storr dealing with the enemies of Science, so we must be making an impact. Another great Evidence News (05/13) with EDitorial COMment from the Creation Research Team worldwide.

© Creation Research 2013

<http://www.creationresearch.net>

<http://www.askjohnmackay.com>

<http://www.youtube.com/user/askjohnmackay#p/u>

<http://evidencweb.net>

ENews is available in 2 FORMATS – for EMAIL scroll down – for PDF see below index.

INDEX

- 1. NEW QUESTIONS**
- 2. WINNER TO ATHEIST QUESTION**
- 3. THE FUNNY SIDE of SIX DAYS?**
- 4. CAVEMEN BETTER THAN MODERN ARTISTS**
- 5. TINY TEETH TELL OF HOBBIT EVOLUTION**
- 6. SPEECH TIMING REVEALED**
- 7. NEANDERTHAL'S BIG EYES CAUSED DEMISE**
- 8. HOLE IN HEAD SHOWS OLD INBREEDING**
- 9. DID YOU MISS**
- 10. FROM THE ARCHIVES**
- 11. DONATIONS**

For ENEWS as PDF – **CLICK [HERE](#)**.

1. NEW QUESTIONS: MUTATION? "I was wondering, has there ever been a documented mutation that produced a completely brand new function in an organism that wasn't there before. I know that there have been a very small amount of beneficial mutations, but every example I've seen involves getting something broken". [Answer](#) by Diane Eager.

2. WINNER TO ATHEIST QUESTION FROM Philosopher Dr. Alex Rosenberg who told theologian Dr. William Lane Craig and the audience, at a debate on the existence of God at Purdue University, Friday 1st Feb, he would "turn Christian" if Craig could explain why God would allow evil. Craig, who does not take Genesis seriously, never did, so we asked our readers to have a go. To see the best answer by Ed Neeland [click](#).

3. **THE FUNNY SIDE of [SIX DAYS?](#)** See a bit of creation history in humour.

4. **CAVEMEN BETTER THAN MODERN ARTISTS**, according to a report in Fossil Science 9 December 2012 and PLoS ONE doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0049786. Anyone who has tried to draw running animals has found it is not easy to accurately depict the relative positions of their moving legs, so what has modern man done to fix this? In the 1880s a photographer named Eadweard Muybridge pioneered the study of how four-legged creatures (quadrupeds) move, using multiple still photos of animals taken in sequence as the animal walked. This has helped modern artists depict walking animals more accurately. A group of Hungarian scientists have now compared pictures of moving animals drawn by modern artists, before and after Muybridge's work, with drawings of such animals left by prehistoric cavemen. They found modern "pre- Muybridge" artists had the highest rate of incorrect leg configuration, but even after Muybridge's work, modern artists are still not as good as cavemen. The error rate was 83.5% for pre-1887 artists and 57.9% post-1887 artists. However, cavemen were way ahead with only 46.2% errors. The research team concluded: "Thus, cavemen were more keenly aware of the slower motion of their prey animals and illustrated quadruped walking more precisely than later artists". The PLoS ONE article is entitled: "Cavemen Were Better at Depicting Quadruped Walking than Modern Artists: Erroneous Walking Illustrations in the Fine Arts from Prehistory to Today".

Link: [Fossil Science](#)

ED. COM. Anyone who has seen the spectacular 'cave man' art in the caves of Europe would agree it is the work of brilliant artists, so we are pleased to see Hungarian researchers refer to it as "fine art". However, if you really want to know why cavemen were better at art than modern man, you will understand it better if you take Biblical history as real, where we learn man was created not from some pre-existing animal, but as the image of God in a separate fully formed creation (Genesis 1:26), and since the Creator God is a very creative artist, don't be surprised design and creative art are a human characteristic as well. But, by the time we get to the dispersal of mankind from the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11), some of the people who moved into cold, rainy Europe made their homes in caves, and used their considerable skill in drawing better 3D buffaloes on cave walls than modern artists can draw. These cavemen were not inferior beings on the way up, but superior beings on the way down to modern artists, who don't do as well with moving animals on average. Such cavemen still retained much of the intelligence and skill inherited from their ancestors who forged metals, made musical instruments, and built cities (Genesis 4), built ocean going boats (Genesis 10) and multi-story towers (Genesis 11). (Ref. painting, drawing, images)

DID YOU MISS our caveman question: "How do I teach my children where the prehistoric cavemen they learn about at school fit into the Bible?" Answer [here](#).

5. **TINY TEETH TELL OF HOBBIT EVOLUTION**, according to a report in New Scientist 6 March 2013. The Hobbit, is the nickname given to an extinct species named 'Homo floresiensis' that is claimed to be a dwarf human by some anthropologists. However, its teeth and brain size are disproportionately small for a typical human dwarf. So Stephen Montgomery of University of Cambridge asks; "If *H. floresiensis* is a dwarf, one of the controversies has been whether it fits with previous patterns of dwarfism". Montgomery and Cambridge colleague Nicholas Mundy have studied marmosets in order to understand how dwarf species form. The pygmy marmoset (*Callithrix pygmaea*) has been considered a dwarf form and also has unusually small teeth. What's the link with teeth size? The New Scientist article explains: "The evolution of a dwarf species usually involves shortening the length of pregnancy or infancy, but recently it has been suggested that there might be a more unusual route: pregnancy length stays the same but the growth of the foetus slows down. This might influence brain and tooth size as these develop early. Montgomery and Mundy found that the pygmy marmoset's pregnancy and infancy are similar in length to their evolutionarily close, larger relations. This suggests they took the unconventional route to small stature". There is some dispute over the relevance of this study to the Hobbit. The New Scientist article goes on to say: "Robert Eckhardt at

Evidence News 05/13 – 27th March 2013

Pennsylvania State University is not convinced. He is adamant that the hobbit is simply a diseased member of our species. But Dean Falk at the Florida State University in Tallahassee thinks the analysis makes a strong case that primates can undergo unusual dwarfism”.

Link: [New Scientist](#)

ED. COM. Over the years, since the *H. floresiensis* bones were first found, we have watched the “dwarf human” vs “diseased human” controversy go back and forth, and get nowhere because the one thing those on both sides of the argument will not allow is that the Hobbit bones are not human. Evolutionary anthropologists really are getting desperate to explain the Hobbit as another species of human, but as more studies of the bones are carried out, the more the evidence shows that these bones belonged to an ape-like creature, similar to an Australopithecine. However, that does not fit into the evolutionary story of apes turning into people in Africa millions of years ago, so it is usually dismissed, and evolutionary anthropologists have to resort to tenuous evidence like the study above. Since human dwarves are still being produced by human parents, we can study their tooth and brain size and dismiss most of the claims in the study – except for one – dwarfism in man is the result of degeneracy from the norm, i.e. devolution not evolution. And the same applies to dwarfism in all present day creatures, runts in pig litters, dog breeding miniatures, and newly produced dwarf plant forms. One related point of interest we find in the fossil record is the trail of decreasing size in many plants and animals down to the present. (Ref. primates, dentition, growth)

Check more evidence on Hobbits in our [Fact File](#). Insert “hobbit” into search box.

SEE OUR DOCUMENTARY DVDs *Darwin on the Rocks* ([preview](#)) and *Darwin's Evolution: A very unnatural selection* ([preview](#)) for more on Giants and dwarfs. These are available from the [webshop](#).

6. SPEECH TIMING REVEALED, as reported in Nature News 20 February 2013 and ABC News in Science 21 February 2013. Edward Chang and colleagues from the University of California San Francisco have carried out a study of brain activity during speech. They were able to record directly from the surface of the brains of patients who had an electrode array implanted under the skull in preparation for brain surgery whilst the patients read consonant and vowel syllables aloud. According to the research team, “Speaking is one of the most complex actions that we perform, but nearly all of us learn to do it effortlessly”. Speaking involves carefully controlled coordinated movements of many muscles in the face, mouth, neck and larynx. These movements are controlled by a region of brain named the ventral sensorimotor cortex (vSMC). Chang’s team’s research was able to show how this region is organised, i.e. which parts control the different components of the vocal tract (jaw, lips, larynx, etc.), how they are arranged, and how they work together during speech. They found the parts of the brain that controlled different parts of the vocal tract were arranged according to the location of these body parts relative to one another. Chang explained: “Like your hand is next to your wrist and your wrist is next to your elbow, the brain seems to reflect those same things with the vocal tract - it seems to go from the lips to the tongue to the jaw to the larynx in the layout”. In order to produce speech different parts of the brain have to be activated in coordinated sequences with millisecond timing, like the musicians in a symphony orchestra each playing notes on their instrument at just the right time. The researchers found that patterns of brain activity consonants and vowels were different even though they use the same parts of the vocal tract. This could explain why “slips of the tongue” usually involve substituting consonant for consonant or vowel for vowel, rather than replacing a vowel with a consonant or vice versa. The study also provides a clue as to why “tongue twisters” are hard to say. The brain coordinates speech movement by how the muscles need to move, rather than by the sound produced. They found different patterns of brain activity for three categories of consonant: front-of-the-tongue sounds, e.g. “ss”; back-of-the-tongue sounds e.g. “g” and lip sounds e.g. “mm” and two categories of vowels – whether they require rounded lips, (as in “oo”) or not. This indicates tongue twisters are hard because they include lots of sounds that are stored in overlapping parts of the brain. For example: in “She sells seashells on the sea shore” the 'ss' and 'sh' are both stored in the brain as front-of-the-tongue

Evidence News 05/13 – 27th March 2013

sounds, and are easily confused. The researchers also found the human larynx is controlled by two areas of the vSMC, whereas in primates there is only one. They commented that the extra brain region for the larynx may be “a unique feature of human vSMC for the specialized control of speech.”

Links: [ABC](#), [Nature News](#)

ED. COM. We are not surprised this research found a brain feature that seems to be unique to humans. Human speech is fundamentally different from any animal noises, and this finding adds to evidence that the human brain is specially designed for speech. As such, this new study on human speech control is a good reminder that the reason we speak is not just because we have more brain cells than other living things, but because we were made ‘in the image of the God who speaks’, and chimps and all their cousins were not. This creator God made our brains to be equipped for speech, under the control of the minds he also gave us. Likewise the millisecond timing in the coordination of the vocal tract is a challenge to anyone who claims speech could evolve by chance random processes. Several of the news articles about this study used the analogy of the split second timing involved in a symphony orchestra producing music, and it is a good illustration of the muscle co-ordinated needed for speech. Playing notes at random timing will not produce any music. To get music, rather than noise, you need to start with information from the composer, which is written down in the music score, which is acted upon with plan and purpose by musicians, who read the music and know how to play their instruments to get the correct sounds. The same occurs with speech. It has to start with information from the mind of the person speaking, and then must be acted upon by the brain cells in the region of brain analysed in this new study. Talk about evidence for a designed system, where all claims we are 98.6% the same as chimps go out the window as futile hope by evolutionists. (Ref. language, neuroscience, articulation, phonetics)

7. NEANDERTHAL'S BIG EYES CAUSED DEMISE, according to articles in ABC News in Science, BBC News and New Scientist 13 March 2013. Eiluned Pearce and Robin Dunbar of Oxford University have compared 13 Neanderthal skulls with 32 *Homo sapiens* skulls and found the Neanderthals had larger eye sockets, by an average of 6mm as measured from top to bottom. (6mm is a little less than a quarter of an inch.) The researchers claim this indicates they had larger eyes, and therefore needed to use more of their brain to process visual information. This left less of their brain available for higher functions, such as forming social groups and developing new tools. Therefore they lost out in the struggle to survive in the ice age. According to Chris Stringer of the natural History Museum, who was also involved in the study, “We infer that Neanderthals had a smaller cognitive (thinking) part of the brain and this would have limited them, including their ability to form larger groups. If you live in a larger group, you need a larger brain in order to process all those extra relationships”. He went on to say: “Even if you had a small percent better ability to react quickly, to rely on your neighbours to help you survive and to pass on information - all these things together gave the edge to *Homo sapiens* over Neanderthals, and that may have made a difference to survival”. The research team suggest Neanderthals evolved large eyes because their ancestors evolved in a gloomy northern European climate, whilst the ancestors of the *Homo sapiens* evolved in brightly lit Africa. According to the BBC article “Up until now, researchers’ knowledge of Neanderthals’ brains has been based on casts of skulls. This has given an indication of brain size and structure, but has not given any real indication of how the Neanderthal brain functioned differently from ours. The latest study is an imaginative approach in trying to address this issue”. Not everyone agrees with the link between eye size and brain function because the African Tarsiers have very big eyes but their visual systems are quite small. The BBC article admits “Previous research by Ms Pearce has shown that modern humans living at higher latitudes evolved bigger vision areas in the brain to cope with lower light levels. There is no suggestion though that their higher cognitive abilities suffered as a consequence”. The ABC article comments: “The relationship between absolute brain size and higher cognitive abilities has long been controversial, the authors admit”.

Links: [ABC](#), [BBC](#), [New Scientist](#)

ED. COM. The BBC article’s comment: “The latest study is an imaginative approach in trying to address this issue,” we can totally agree with - with the emphasis on “imaginative”. For a start, there are no

Evidence News 05/13 – 27th March 2013

fossilised Neanderthal eyeballs and since all living eye sockets contains muscles, support and insulating tissues as well as blood vessels and nerves that fit in the space between the eyeballs and the bony socket walls, and none of these were preserved either – just empty eye sockets, they do not know accurately how big their eyeballs actually were. Furthermore, to use eye size to estimate how much brain capacity was needed for processing visual information it is necessary to also know how much information was being sent to their brain from the eyes, so any answer re Neanderthal's is only a guess-timate. To really know you need and be able to study a live brain while a person is actually looking at things. Furthermore, as the BBC article comments, even if they really did have bigger eyes and vision processing areas, that is no proof they were lacking in intelligence or social complexity. The comparative study referred to by the BBC, was of modern humans who lived at higher latitudes. They were found to have larger eyes but no-one would suggest these people were lacking in intelligence, or social skills. Therefore, without any actual tests of intelligence, it is impossible to say how smart Neanderthals were. All studies of Neanderthal remains, along with studies of their living spaces and artefacts, put them within the present human range, even their overall brain size was larger than the modern average, so even if they used more brain space for vision they would have had plenty left for thinking, personal interaction, and other fully human activities. (Ref. vision, neuroscience, cavemen)

The study of modern humans referred to by the BBC is "Latitudinal variation in light levels drives human visual system size", *Biology Letters* doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2011.0570, 23 February 2012.

For more on human brain sizes see our slide show "Brain Drain" [here](#).

For more evidence that Neanderthals were fully human click [here](#).

8. HOLE IN HEAD SHOWS OLD INBREEDING according to an article in ScienceDaily 18 March 2013 and Fossil Science 22 March 2013. Researchers from Chinese Academy of Sciences and Washington University, St. Louis have found pieces of an ancient human skull with hole in the top known as "enlarged parietal foramen", which occurs because the two bones that form the vault of the skull fail to grow together properly. This is a rare defect that can occur in living humans, and is now known to be caused by mutations of the genes ALX4 on chromosome 11 and MSX2 on chromosome 5. According to ScienceDaily and Fossil Science, "Traces of genetic abnormalities, such as EPF, are seen unusually often in the skulls of Pleistocene humans, from early *Homo erectus* to the end of the Paleolithic". Erik Trinkaus, one of the researchers, commented: "The probability of finding one of these abnormalities in the small available sample of human fossils is very low, and the cumulative probability of finding so many is exceedingly small". This new finding along with "an unusually high incidence of rare conditions among these Pleistocene humans" indicates there was significant inbreeding within the population at that time. Link: [ScienceDaily](#), [Fossil Science](#)

ED. COM. Inbreeding occurs when a small population becomes isolated from the larger human race, and this is what began to happen to man, first when only one family of eight survived the flood and even more when society was further split into isolated small groups after man was scattered at the Tower of Babel. Genesis tells us that after the Flood, Noah's descendants grew into some 70 family groups, but rather than obey God who had told them to spread out across the planet, they gathered together to make a name for themselves and storm heaven via the infamous Tower (Genesis 11). God judged them by splitting them up into different language groups which became the ancestors of all modern 'races'.

The initial groups would have been groups of related people, similar to what we would call clan groups. As these migrated away from Babel all would have become isolated from others and become inbred. At the same time the environment was becoming harsher and the mutation rate was increasing, so such mutations would become common within an inbreeding group. One factor in causing the decrease in lifespan of man, recorded after Shem (Genesis 10/11), as well as embedding the racial characteristics,

Evidence News 05/13 – 27th March 2013

such as skin colour, etc. The now provable high rate of abnormalities in this newly discovered group of so-called “primitive man” is evidence that these remains are not some kind of pre-human creatures evolving upwards, but human beings afflicted by degeneration. As such, they are a reminder that the human race is not a rising species, but a fallen one, suffering the effects of human sin and God’s judgement, and in need of a Saviour. (Ref. genetics, mutations, malformations)

9. DID YOU MISS our question: Who did Cain marry? Answer [here](#).

10. FROM THE ARCHIVES: [Brains and Language](#), [Smart Neanderthals](#), [Clever Cavemen](#), [Human Mutations](#).

11. DONATIONS: Get involved in sharing the cost and the blessings of the research and teaching by becoming part of the worldwide support team today via our secure [Web Site](#), or send gifts to the following addresses:

Donations in USA/UK are tax deductible. See instructions online.

AUSTRALIA: P.O. Box 260 Capalaba Qld 4157

CANADA: C/- Martin Legemaate 12919 Warden Ave Stouffville ON L4A 7X5

TAX DEDUCTIBLE SUPPORT FOR OUR COLLEAGUES

<http://www.creationtruthministries.org/donatepayments.html>.

NEW ZEALAND: P.O. Box 40480 Glenfield 0747, Auckland

UK: P.O. Box 1 Ashton under Lyne Lancs. OL6 9WW (Donations in UK payable to Creation Research Trust are tax deductible - a Gift Aid Declaration is required - available from <http://www.amen.org.uk/cr/trust/>)

USA: P.O. Box 281 Hartsville TN 37074 (Donations in USA are tax deductible. Make checks to Creation Education Society)

IF YOU no longer wish to receive our updates please reply with REMOVE EN in the subject. To assist us please include your name as well as e-mail address (and organisation name, if any).

www.askjohnmackay.com

www.evidencweb.net

www.creationresearch.net