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2 Men: Not

2 Mille?
Oldest known bee fossilized in amber

Continued from Page 6D.

rial has probably decomposed, Gri
maldi said. What is seen inside the
translucent amber is only a carbon
coated cast of the insect, but the de-
tails of its legs, wings, abdomen and
head are so fine that scientists can
draw many conclusions.

Grimaldi, working with Charles
D. Michener, a research associate in
evernology at the University of
Kansas, concluded that the pre-
served features show the bee to be a
new species of the genus Trigona in
the subfamily of bees known as
Meliponinae.

The oldest preserved bee previ-
ously discovered was about 45 mil-
lion years old. But scientists have
assumed that bees probably go back
at least 125 million years. Fossils of
pollen, leaves and even flowers in-
dicate that this was the time when
flowering plants appeared in profu-
sion, and it is generally believed
that bees evolved from ancestral
wasps at about the same time.

The bee in amber seems to lend
support to this timetable, or even to
a much earlier appearance of
flowering plants and bees.

Both Grimaldi and Michener
note the importance of the fossil
bee being stinging. It was thus a
fairly advanced species because it
must have evolved considerably
from ancestors with stingless. The
females of most bee species have
stingers, which are modifications
of an egg-laying part of the body;
males never have stingers. The
fossil bee was female.

Other remarkably modern fea-
tures of the fossil bee were its
wings and hind legs, the entomolo-
gists said. The structure of the hind
legs indicated that the bees carried
pollen in the same way that modern
bees do.

Michener suggested that to
reach this advanced state, bees
must have undergone "relatively
rapid" evolution sometime before
80 million years ago. Thus, he said,
the fossil bee certainly seems to
confirm the idea that bees must be
far older than 80 million years and
probably date from at least 125 mil-
lion years ago, or whenever flower-
ing plants appeared.

Most scientists have long be-
vieled that the origin and diversifi-
cation of flowering plants went
hand in hand with that of bees on
the supposition that many flowers
require bees to pollinate them and
bees require flowers for the
proteins from pollen and carbon-
draters from nectar.

James A. Doyle, a paleobotanist
at the University of California at
Davis, said recent findings indicate
that some flowering plants may
have emerged as much as 200 mil-
lion years ago, long before the Cre-
taceous period.
Our Mother, the Orangutan?

by Kenneth Cumming

The possibility of tracing one's family tree, not just back to Africa, Asia, Europe and so forth as many of us have done but all the way back to the first human mother, presented itself recently. At least that is what some excited biochemical researchers are hoping to do. However, these researchers are not expecting to find Eve but rather some other primate much like the orangutan as the mother of us all.

Dr. Douglas Wallace of Atlanta's Emory University has been a contributing author to a growing number of science papers whose objective is to trace mankind's family tree back in history by using genetic markers that can be found inside most human cells. What is unique about these studies is that the markers are inherited only through the mother from generation to generation.

Within most cells are little machines (mitochondria) that produce the energy for the cell. These machines in a similar fashion to the brain (nucleus) of every cell have their own genetic instructions (DNA). However, unlike the nucleus, which inherits information from both parents, the mitochondria seem to receive genetic information only from the mother. This makes tracing the path of inheritance exceedingly easier than when both parental traits are mixed.

Dr. Wallace has studied these markers in more than 800 people worldwide and concludes that the ancestors of the human race originated in central Asia about 100,000 years ago. In a news article entitled "World May Share a Mother," Wallace is quoted as saying, "I like to think of it as a biological history book of women." The thought of tracing human lineages is of great interest to Christians too, for it would be of considerable interest to corroborate the biblical record of the distribution of ethnic groups. For the Jews, it would be interesting to reestablish the lineage of the 12 tribes, which has been effectively lost in the course of time.

So far, four problems arise from the interpretation of Wallace's study. First, although the time for the origin of mankind has already been considerably shortened (from 250,000 to 100,000 years) over the traditional evolutionary scenario, this reduction is not compatible with a literal interpretation of scripture.

Second, the location of origin is considered to be China rather than Africa as the anthropologists have been claiming. Here again the center of dispersion is changing but not yet in concert with scripture.

Third, the new technique appears to have more interpretive value than it probably deserves. In similar molecular homology studies for other living large molecules (such as cytochrome c), early results indicated a progressive phylogeny from fish to man. Later, when much more data was known but not discussed very much, the neat phylogenies turned into isolated kinds just as in the old naming of organisms, cats and dogs are inherently different, so are their proteins.

Finally, the means by which dates are assigned to these lineages is open to great uncertainty. One researcher in Wallace's papers was quoted as saying the divergence occurred somewhere between 10,000 and 50,000 years ago. Wallace believes 100,000 years ago. These numbers appear to be highly speculative and based on unproven assumptions of mutation rates.

The prospect of tracing mankind's lineage back to the dispersion is an exciting one. But the problems associated with the interpretation of place and time of origin as well as animal associations ought to make Christians reject the present evolutionary conclusion that the woman originated in China 100,000 years ago and shows close affinities to the orangutan.
I. A Man is Distinct From a Beast

1. A man walks erect
   no other animal stands up, walks erect
   q. an anthropoid mammal, moves through the jungle on all fours.
   a. when an anthropoid stands upright, moves
      so ludicrously, uncomfortably

2. Differ in his countenance
   the sight, intelligence in his eyes
   II Cor. 4:6 "for God..."
   the intelligence? and I in His face

3. Differ in his ontological framework,
   in his bone structure
   e.g. a man has a brain, the creation
   that has a hand
   a thumb in opposition to his fingers,
   a man to handle a tool, multithreaded
   movements of the hand? with the open? or being the? it? a device? the car? a bird - the hand? a man
4. Differ in his reason, in intuitive judgment, in the teaching, theology in or adjutant, in the essence.

5. Differ in his spirit, in his soul, in the divine union, in his beauty, in his bodily frame.

Isa. 3:7

Who hath a soul, a mental consciousness, the ability to reason, the ability to think, the ability to think, the ability to think, the ability to think.

Prof. Troward of Boston University.

"Except for a minor incident where a conscience at the beginning, and until what organic activity does nothing to do, and what past religion, what its light, and the religious power come to the aid of the human race, mankind long since would have disappeared from the face of the earth."
There are two explanations.

1. The first, as we might say, is the common sense explanation. 

   The Bible account: 
   
   1. God created man physically, mentally, morally, emotionally.
   2. Man fell: became subject to the promised deliverance, redemption.

2. The other explanation is called a theory, a hypothesis, a supposition, an event or an admitted guess. It is not a fact, but a materialists' effort to explain the phenomena of man by a mechanism, accidental process called evolution.

   If you like this: Somehow, sometime, there came into existence a primeval
prototropin, let an ant be a little animal wholly a little animal similar to an animal a little more of first place
and from that animal extended on all to become a kind man, now man as developed, evolved.

Charles Darwin, p. 527, The Origin of Species, writes his conclusion:
"Ecology would lead me to ask by the help of all animals and plants are derived from some non-plant.
and everything starts from a common origin. All the organic beings now living are descended from some non-plant.

If a man gazes at a wheat stem
or fire, how much more does he grasp in amazement at this evolutionary hypothesis. An evolutionist considers the animal
as an emerging new species or an organism. The only they they have
or common is the fact that they are that all living things derived from a
germinal cell. Then they go beyond
The fact is, there are as many evolutionary theories as there are enthusiasts. But the basic assumption of the accepted truth of evolution has been received almost universally by the academic world.

How is the argument? A book on the origins and evolution of living things refers to any argument for the truth of evolution. The claim is that evolution is a universal law. Evolution is a greater intellectual achievement of the 19th century. Evolution became legitimate in the 19th century. Evolution is the work of a theory.

And there is a saying from another book: "Man and ape are equally descended from a common prototype."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>extinct ape</th>
<th>simian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ape&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;simian&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;man&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;anthropes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;gibbon&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;orang&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But there remains the work of a theory.
ancient was a remote previous genus on Earth in pre-arcanic time, say 10,000,000 years ago. Paleontologists estimate. The Age was probably preceded—Earth in time!—until the ancient age. Mammals show this in their scores.

The message of an article is the message of the ancient mammals in Australia. 

Text, "fossil" = mammalics. 

Mammals are animals who are thought to have evolved from reptiles. 

Does not support the point. 

A good life.
III: Why not be a theatre undertaker?

But did it - not as the 36th way
but as the evolutment way - but
not did it.

Darwin: "I can use reason why the
degree given in the volume should
with the feeling I agree."

A celebrated preacher once wrote to me: "I fear gradually
learned to see that it is just as
plausible an assumption to the
belief that God created a few original forms
believe that God created man on
it depends on the facts."

Why not be a theatre undertaker?

1. It is not biologically true.
   "Natural"
   "Scientifically correct"
   "Doubtable"
   "No."
(1) **A pet theory evocative...**

The transition, transmutation, signify by natural selection, sexual selection. Those multitudes I choose, the animal present any a ey and briefly become a man.

**But the effect to true.** By another selects the upper... down aw down.

\[ \text{drove down a way, Domain Core: package, omnivore.} \]

\[ \text{Drop: nematode, worm...} \]

There is intelligence to hear, read must be heard again - the go down.

(2) **Another pet theory: survived the flood, the world destroyed, the story remains,**

\[ \text{e.g. the Dinosaurs,} \]

\[ \text{Auror for graceful, terrestrial beings...} \]

\[ \text{Dinosaurs, sauropods...} \]

So a dinosaur is a terrible, coiled egg. Firey monster - one ceased ever think themselves change the air,

\[ \text{by surprised, the ghosts, strange, the less fern...} \]
Another thing - D.Y.M.A.N.C. 3 the race or 3 men or 2 footballs.

It illustrated the theory by its example. Mr. Duncan built the visual memory. The
context "prehistory" is clear, typically help them to climb, young function to tree.

But theory until you see at the garden - can chat straight of people, a look at the baseball Cape - go to or put inside it has no fact at all, next wear a tennis, memory stick.

Of the early field's Mammal's care, with you find in the same case, more
darkness, only as best with right that been deeply written by the same
dark conditions.
they are not unprofitable and are unnecessary.

John Hayley admitted, "Jordan brook through the photographe? the jest? for a new read the fagot? I have not any mean? forming a conclusion? its appearance in the earth."

Where did the come from? The photographe says he was a time when there wasn't any. The present

Butt Butt says The photographe says it came of itself — The present generation which has never been seen, which cannot be predicted, which is not predictable, and which the great intellect least they is not invisible to scientists.

Then where did it come from? The Book says God created it.
Why are I not a创建 evolutionist?

2. The theory is spiritually narrow.

You cannot ste these two areas go in opposite directions. They are opposite.

The Bible presents a world created by a hand; 7 got a personal God who created all the things we see and know.

The theory of evolution says that all we see came about through a common process, through a materialistic, agnostic process, for which they have no explanation. Thus for which they have no explanation. Thus for which they have no explanation. The things with no meaning.

The Bible says man was created perfect, at the top, with all he needed, he forever only — and he fall, down, down.

The evolution says at he started at a bottom in a little primordial soup and has been crime and more since.

The two are diametrically opposite.

The Bible: Man is a creations of the moral law.

The evolution: Man is nothing but the animal.
Listen to Easter, my dear greatest, greatest son of all time — my greatest, greatest, greatest, greatest! My greatest soul. I sorted out my deep reach at the foot of my modern, materialistic revolution. The near, the near, the near. I know, I am at the near. To the near.

And again: "The near I know, as near nearly as my feet, set 2 a certain precedent. If I could move, all, I would move. As feet 2 a certain precedent woman."