



## Evolution and Religion... or religion and religion?

### Honesty? *Early Man* (Time-Life Books)

"The matching up of the Lewis find and the Leakey find into one good *Ramapithecus* jaw was suggested by Elwyn Simons of Yale, and the identification of the two as a single species (although one came from India and one from Africa) was pushed by him. Hoping to further strengthen *Ramapithecus*' credentials, he decided to search all the fossil collections at Yale and other places to see if he could not find some clues that had been overlooked by previous examiners...Its credentials as man's oldest known direct ancestor are thus advanced one step further." (Page 38) **Was *Ramapithecus* based on two jawbone parts, from two different continents?**

"The subject of this chapter is *Homo Erectus*, and his story is a near-perfect example of the wild surmise eventually made respectable." **At least the author is honest about the dishonesty.** (Page 77)

"Once the idea of man's evolutionary development is accepted, his origins can theoretically be traced back to the beginning of life itself- a matter of two billion years. For practical purposes, however, the point at which to study the beginnings of man is when he began to have the first faint traces of manishness. How far into the past to dig for such traces- what even to keep and eye out for- is something of a problem." (Page 31)

**Is the author saying all evidence is examined through the eyes of the acceptance of man's evolution.** This is not science. Scientists are supposed to draw conclusion based on evidence...not to prove pre-concieved conclusions.

Is evolution based on wild surmise and pre-conceived ideas? If so, it is based on blind faith. It sounds like we are dealing with **religion** and religion, not **evolution** and religion.