

Eve or Ape

Genes do not explain life – something else is happening

Our present situation can be more clearly understood if we see that the platform for the "anti-human" program is Humanist philosophy! Humanist philosophy is based firmly on the theory of chance evolution and that theory relies entirely on 'plausible' explanations of how evolution creates life. In turn this relies on plausible persuasion that environment gives chance mutations a potential for gradual improvement by natural selection.

When we understand this we see where comes the need for fanatical defence of the theory of chance evolution.

Large donations to leading Universities (encouraged by government tax concessions), gave private interests power to direct research. Thus human culture is open to corruption! As specialists in various disciplines are too involved in their speciality to see life's big picture clearly, whether life may be a chance creation or a creation of some eternal force, seems hardly a life or death issue to them.

Fanatics go to great lengths to defend their projects. I even read of a University department head removing pages from a magazine to avoid challenging argument.

That stupidity obviously failed and served the culprit poorly, but more sophisticated censorship, backed by money, disinformation and plausible disguise, works very well.

A blanket censorship on public research is not clever. However, a showing of matters few people understand or appreciate, on 2nd level TV, causes no problem. If some who are concerned see it, they find it difficult to challenge or dissect from a single viewing.

Then, to further minimise danger of challenge, copies are only available to approved educational facilities that have to accept some form of security agreement.

Why this slight-of-hand? All sale of DVDs, once the program is set up, are profitable. So this program, obviously, was not made for profit! So for what?

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 has a feeling it's banned.

Homo Futurus, a documentary about a new, non-evolutionary theory of human creation - origins and future – was displayed on SBS TV.

What education facility is going to buy and publicise it? Public education has been indoctrinating Humanist philosophy and chance evolution over generations. This facility doesn't invite rocking the boat.

Christian schools? Well they 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 now 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 always in serious scientific dispute, has worked perfectly – to now.

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

Internet comment on that program:

Homo Futurus. Broadcast, 7th May '07, SBS. Copies not available for sale to the public but points from the Internet to support my memory. Quote: *"What made early humans stand up and take their first steps? What is the next step in human development? These 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-Joséphine 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."

"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 - it wasn't driven 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, large change, beneficial in future environment and occurring suddenly after very long intervals, denies gradual mutation. The research argument is valid and in basic agreement with GNIEB><BEING. Also this is not the first science to see that change is not related to gradual DNA evolution. The facts are best explained as being consequent to design forces.]

"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: Evolutionists avoid facing the facts. In GNIEB><BEING you will have seen that change needs to be planned. It needs to move with the development of earth until such time as the earth is ready for the human development. Changes of life-forms is planned to create an environment suited to the human intellectual development.]

As shown in G><B, physics cannot explain our universe; nor, despite 100 years of determined effort, can plausible genetics explain life. All life was planned by one mind and one system serves all physical life.

Though evolutionists pretend the small difference between genes of man and ape is proof of relationship, common genes are not uncommon, nor can mutation and chance selection create progressive advance.

As earth reaches development targets new, complete, life-forms appear, plausible claims for DNA fit neither logic or facts! Something else is happening.

So let us look at another research finding that challenges the theory that cannot be called science; the theory devoted to evolution. 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, is producing the kind of human behaviour that will destroy us? Is that good enough for you?

Is it not likely that, when open-minded research is done, we will find characteristics described above as relating to the ape brain box will also apply to the dolphin; same designer, same principles, same materials, same tools, same nature – different 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? I cannot say but I can say that any scientific congress, conference or research that reveals the weakness of the evolution theory, quickly fades from public view.

But information about dolphins and folklore stretches the length of human history. To start:
<http://home.snafu.de/ulisses/tursiops.htm>

For associated literature on the human situation:
www.lifetruth.org.au
www.themindweb.com.or
www.gniebxbeing.org.uk