Human Evolution Fossil Evidence: Methodological Investigation

Purpose

This document examines the discovery methodology, physical evidence, and scientific questions surrounding key specimens in human evolutionary theory.

---

1. SAHELANTHROPUS TCHADENSIS (6-7 Million Years)

Discovery

- Found 2001 in Chad by Ahounta Djimdoumalbaye, member of Brunet's team
- 6 fossils total from site TM 266

Physical Evidence

- TM 266-01-060-1: Distorted cranium, nearly complete but badly crushed
- Additional fragments: 2 lower jaw fragments, 3 isolated teeth
- Femur (TM 266-01-063) and mandible found 2.5km away - "association is based on provenance but remains to be demonstrated"

Dating Methods

- Biochronology (comparing fauna) suggests 6-7 million years
- Pieces "may have been transported and reburied in modern times"

Preservation

- Skull severely crushed and distorted
- "Difficult to interpret given the preservation of the specimen"

Scientific Questions

- "Bipedalism in Sahelanthropus is heavily disputed"
- Femur and jaw "not confirmed to belong to same species as cranium"
- "Difficult to determine whether Sahelanthropus is a hominin or an ape due to missing postcranial elements"

---

2. ORRORIN TUGENENSIS (6.2-5.7 Million Years)

Discovery

- Found 2000 in Kenya by Brigitte Senut and Martin Pickford's team
- From 4 different sites in Tugen Hills

Physical Evidence

- 20 fossils from at least 5 individuals
- Consists of: partial femora, partial humeri, phalanx, lower jaw fragment with teeth
- "Few body parts recovered"

Dating Methods

- Biostratigraphy and radiometric dating of volcanic layers

Preservation

- Fossils "initially not made available to scientific community"
- Scattered across multiple sites

Scientific Questions

- "Debate remains unresolved" regarding bipedalism
- Limited postcranial evidence
- "Difficult to assess locomotor capabilities"

---

3. ARDIPITHECUS KADABBA (5.77-5.54 Million Years)

Discovery

- Found 1997-2001 in Ethiopia, Middle Awash area
- Originally considered subspecies of A. ramidus

Physical Evidence

- 19 specimens: "teeth and bits and pieces of the skeleton"
- Toe bone (ALA-VP-2/10) found 16km away from main fossils
- Toe bone "several hundred thousand years younger" than other specimens

Dating Methods

- Argon-argon dating of volcanic ash layers

Preservation

- Highly fragmentary
- Specimens scattered across different locations and time periods

Scientific Questions

- "Not enough evidence due to fragmentary nature of the fossils"
- Toe bone interpretation "disputed by some researchers"
- Classification as separate species questioned

---

4. ARDIPITHECUS RAMIDUS (4.4 Million Years)

Discovery

- Found 1992-1993 in Ethiopia by Tim White's team
- "Ardi" specimen (ARA-VP-6/500) recovered over multiple field seasons

Physical Evidence

- "Ardi": 100+ bone fragments
- Pelvis "reconstructed from crushed specimen"
- "Crushed nearly to smithereens" - required 15 years to reconstruct

Dating Methods

- Radiometric dating of volcanic ash layers
- May be younger than Australopithecus it supposedly preceded

Preservation

- Severely crushed and fragmented
- "Difficult to interpret the crushed pelvis"

Scientific Questions

- "Not sufficient anatomical evidence to support exclusively human lineage"
- Temporal paradox: may postdate supposed descendants
- Reconstruction from crushed bones raises interpretation questions

5. AUSTRALOPITHECUS AFARENSIS ("Lucy" - AL 288-1)

Discovery

- Found 1974 in Ethiopia by Donald Johanson
- Surface find in gully after rainstorm

Physical Evidence

- 47 bone fragments representing ~40% of skeleton
- "Several dozen fragments of bone" found on hillside
- Baboon vertebra (L3-L4) included in original reconstruction for 40 years (1974-2015)

Dating Methods

- Potassium-argon dating of volcanic layers above/below
- Dated to 3.2 million years

Preservation

- Fragmentary, scattered on surface
- Mixed with other animal bones in area
- Bones "may have been transported by water or scavengers"

Scientific Questions

- How was baboon bone misidentified as Lucy's vertebra for 40 years?
- If surface scatter, how certain is association of all fragments to one individual?
- What other fragments might be misattributed?

---

6. AUSTRALOPITHECUS AFARENSIS ("First Family" - AL 333)

Discovery

- Found 1975 in Ethiopia, same area as Lucy
- Site AL 333

Physical Evidence

- 250+ fossils from minimum 17 individuals (later estimates: 9-17 individuals)

- "Disarticulated bones scattered across hillside"
- Mix of adult and juvenile specimens

Dating Methods

- Same volcanic layers as Lucy (~3.2 million years)

Preservation

- Completely disarticulated
- "Fragmentary remains"
- Bones scattered over area, not articulated

Scientific Questions

- "Difficult to assign bones to specific individuals"
- Could represent normal population variation rather than separate species
- How many individuals actually represented?

---

7. HOMO HABILIS (OH 7, OH 24, KNM-ER 1813)

Discovery

- OH 7: Found 1960 by Jonathan and Mary Leakey at Olduvai Gorge
- OH 24: Found 1968 at Olduvai Gorge
- KNM-ER 1813: Found 1973 at Lake Turkana by Kamoya Kimeu

Physical Evidence

- OH 7 (holotype): Hand bones, partial skull fragments, lower jaw
- OH 24 ("Twiggy"): Crushed cranium fragments
- KNM-ER 1813: Partial skull, heavily reconstructed

Dating Methods

- Originally dated ~1.75 million years
- Redated multiple times with significant changes

Preservation

- OH 24 found "crushed flat"
- Fragmentary and incomplete specimens

- Extensive reconstruction required

Scientific Questions

- "Validity as a distinct species is controversial"
- "Some scientists believe H. habilis should be split into multiple species"
- "Others think all H. habilis specimens are actually Australopithecus"
- Extensive variation suggests possible multiple species lumped together

---

8. HOMO ERECTUS (Various Specimens)

Discovery

- Java Man: Found 1891-1892 by Eugène Dubois
- Peking Man: Found 1920s-1930s at Zhoukoudian, China
- Multiple sites across Africa and Asia

Physical Evidence

- Java Man: Skullcap and femur found 15 meters apart, one year apart
- Peking Man: ~40 individuals - ALL ORIGINAL FOSSILS LOST during WWII
- Only casts remain of Peking Man

Dating Methods

- Originally dated ~500,000-1.9 million years
- Wide range of dates and significant controversy

Preservation

- Java: Skull and femur separated by distance and time
- Peking: Original evidence no longer exists, only casts and drawings
- Wide geographic distribution complicates species definition

Scientific Questions

- Are Java skullcap and femur from same individual?
- With Peking Man originals lost, how reliable are interpretations from casts?
- Does wide variation indicate one species or multiple?
- Some scientists suggest H. erectus specimens should be divided into multiple species

9. NEANDERTHAL (Homo neanderthalensis)

Discovery

- First recognized specimen: Neander Valley, Germany, 1856
- Hundreds of specimens since across Europe and Asia

Physical Evidence

- Original specimen: Partial skeleton from limestone cave
- Later finds include more complete specimens
- Genetic evidence based on ONE specimen initially (Neander Valley type)

Dating Methods

- Various methods: radiocarbon (for recent), ESR, uranium-series
- Dates range ~40,000-400,000 years

Genetic Evidence Issues

- "Neanderthal" DNA defined as ~27 mitochondrial differences vs. 8 in modern humans
- Based on assumption of separate species
- Ancient human populations had HIGHER genetic diversity than modern
- "What they're calling 'Neanderthal DNA' could just be ancient human variation that's now mostly extinct"

Scientific Questions

- How was species distinction determined from fragmentary initial evidence?
- Could "Neanderthal DNA" represent extinct human genetic variation rather than separate species?
- Why use arbitrary threshold (27 vs 8 differences) to define species?

---

10. DENISOVAN (Denisova hominin)

Discovery

- Found 2008 in Denisova Cave, Siberia
- Discovered by Russian archaeologists

Physical Evidence

- ONE finger bone fragment

- TWO teeth
- Partial skull fragment (found 2019)
- "Entire species" defined from these minimal remains

Dating Methods

- Radiocarbon and uranium-series dating
- Estimated 30,000-50,000 years

Genetic Evidence

- Defined primarily by DNA from finger bone
- Classified as separate species based on genetic differences
- Same circular reasoning as Neanderthal: assuming ancient genetic diversity = separate species

Scientific Questions

- Can an entire species be validly defined from one finger bone and two teeth?
- How reliable are species-level distinctions from such minimal evidence?
- Could represent normal ancient human variation?

---

11. HOMO HEIDELBERGENSIS (Mauer 1)

Discovery

- Mauer Jaw found 1907 in Germany by mine workers
- Found at 24 meters depth in river sand deposits

Physical Evidence

- ONE jawbone (mandible)
- "Nearly complete except for missing premolars and first two left molars"
- Found with extinct elephant and rhinoceros remains

Dating Methods

- Originally ~500,000 years
- Later radiometric dating suggested ~600,000 years
- Multiple redating with changing estimates

Species Definition Issues

- "The utility of H. heidelbergensis is complicated by its definition on a jaw"
- "The majority of specimens do not preserve any mandibular remains that would permit direct comparison with holotype"
- "No consensus has arisen concerning their classification"
- Called the "muddle in the middle"

Scientific Questions

- How can species be defined on ONE jaw with most assigned specimens having NO jaw to compare?
- Which supposed "common ancestor" is correct: H. heidelbergensis, H. antecessor, H. erectus, or others?
- "There is agreement among all paleo-anthropologists that the lower jaw of Mauer does not belong to the immediate ancestral line of modern man"
- Could the Mauer jaw be from an extinct ape (like Piltdown orangutan jaw, accepted 40 years)?

---

12. HOMO GEORGICUS (Dmanisi Hominins)

Discovery

- First specimen: Jaw found 1991 at Dmanisi, Georgia
- Found by German graduate student Antje Justus on "last day" of dig
- Lying directly under saber-toothed cat skeleton

Physical Evidence

- 5 skulls (Skulls 1-5), over 100 postcranial fossils
- From minimum 5 individuals at single site
- Skull 5 discovered 2005, jaw (D2600) found 5 years earlier
- "Species primitive in skull and upper body but with relatively advanced spines and lower limbs"

Dating Methods

- Originally 1.2-1.8 million years
- Later refined to 1.77-1.85 million years
- Based on volcanic layers and paleomagnetic dating

Variation Issues

- Skull 5: Brain only 546cc (smallest of group)
- Other skulls: 601-730cc

- Jaw found 5 years before matching skull
- "Variation so large that had they been discovered at different sites, they most likely would have been classified as different species"

Scientific Questions

- **Species Definition Disputed**: "Classification controversial and disputed"
- Proposed as separate species H. georgicus OR subspecies H. erectus georgicus OR just H. erectus
- Variation within group "does not exceed that found in modern populations of our own species, nor in chimps and bonobos"
- "Had braincase and face of Skull 5 been found as separate fossils at different sites in Africa, they might have been attributed to different species"
- "Many hominin fossils formerly thought to be different species may not have been separate species at all"

---

13. HOMO ERGASTER (African Homo erectus)

Discovery

- KNM-ER 992 (type specimen): Jaw found 1971 by Bernard Ngeneo, Kenya
- KNM-ER 3733: Skull found 1975 by Bernard Ngeneo
- KNM-WT 15000 ("Turkana Boy"): Found 1984 by Kamoya Kimeu

Physical Evidence

- KNM-ER 992: Lower jaw, originally classified as H. habilis, reclassified 1975
- KNM-ER 3733: Near-complete skull, ~850cc brain
- Turkana Boy: 40% complete skeleton (most complete early Homo)

Dating Methods

- KNM-ER 3733: 1.63±0.15 million years (magnetostratigraphy)
- Turkana Boy: ~1.5-1.6 million years
- Dating of volcanic ash layers

Preservation & Interpretation

- KNM-ER 3733: "Only upper portion of orbits protruding from ground"
- Turkana Boy: Missing feet and one humerus
- Features assume 40% can represent 100% ("bones from one side can tell what other side looked like")

Scientific Questions

- **Species Validity Disputed**: "Not everyone accepts this species name, some still prefer to use the term African Homo erectus"
- "Whether they represent distinct species (H. ergaster) or African H. erectus is debated"
- Turkana Boy age estimate varies: "11-12 years would seem to be best compromise"
- "Differences between Turkana Boy and other H. ergaster material suggest they may not represent same taxon"
- "None of the fossils seemed to represent H. erectus either, which was in need of significant revision"
- Dmanisi specimens "believed to have originated from H. erectus lineage" - connects to H. georgicus controversy

---

14. HOMO ANTECESSOR (Gran Dolina, Spain)

Discovery

- Found 1994-1996 at Gran Dolina, Atapuerca, Spain
- Discovered by Aurora Martín Nájera in 30cm layer (nicknamed "Aurora Stratum")
- Railway construction in 1900s exposed cave sediments

Physical Evidence

- 170+ specimens from at least 6 individuals
- Type specimen ATD6-69: Cranium of 10-year-old juvenile
- "Some experts claim having juvenile as type specimen is problem as features may be juvenile traits"
- Best preserved: ATD6-15 and ATD6-69, possibly same individual

Dating Methods

- Originally dated ~800,000-900,000 years
- Later ESR dating: 772,000-949,000 years
- Tooth analysis (ATD6-92) ranges 624,000-949,000 years
- Sima del Elefante jaw: 1.2-1.4 million years

Sediment & Distribution Issues

- "Hominin remains accumulated by geological processes"
- Fossils found in three facies: debris flow, channel facies, floodplain facies

- "Some remains came from adjacent slope above cave or cave entry"
- Fossils scattered in mixed fluvial and gravity flow deposits

New 2022 Discovery Contradicts Species

- 2022: Facial fragment "Pink" (ATE7-1) found, 1.1-1.4 million years old
- "Pink does not belong to species Homo antecessor"
- Features "more robust and projected forward" vs. slender Gran Dolina face
- Classified as "Homo affinis erectus" - different species entirely
- "Discovery reveals existence of human species that had not been documented in Europe"

Scientific Questions

- **Species Validity Highly Debated**: "This species name is highly debated with many considering remains to be Homo heidelbergensis"
- **Common Ancestor Claim Disputed**: Proposed as "last common ancestor of Neanderthals and modern humans" but widely contested
- Evidence of cannibalism: Cut marks on bones
- Type specimen is juvenile - may show only juvenile traits
- Older finds don't match the species definition

---

15. HOMO FLORESIENSIS ("Hobbit")

Discovery

- Found September 2, 2003 at Liang Bua cave, Flores, Indonesia
- Joint Australian-Indonesian team led by Mike Morwood
- LB1 (type specimen): Nearly complete female skeleton

Physical Evidence

- LB1: ~1.06m tall (3'6"), brain 417cc, ~30 years old
- Partial skeletons of 15 individuals total (as of 2015)
- "Only one complete skull" (LB1)
- Bones "not fossilized" - "consistency of wet blotting paper"
- "Once exposed, bones had to be left to dry before they could be dug up"

Dating Changes

- Originally: 38,000-13,000 years ago
- Revised 2016: 100,000-60,000 years ago
- Stone tools: 190,000-50,000 years ago
- Older specimens from Mata Menge: ~700,000 years ago

Controversy & Removal of Fossils

- December 2004: Teuku Jacob removed most remains from repository
- Done "with permission" but controversial
- Various pathology claims: microcephaly, pygmy with disease, Laron syndrome
- "These claims have subsequently been widely rejected"

Scientific Questions

- **Origin Disputed**: Two competing hypotheses:
  1. Dwarfed descendant of H. erectus (insular dwarfism)
  2. Descendant of more primitive species (H. habilis or Australopithecus-grade)
- **How did they reach Flores?** "Nearest island 9km away across treacherous seas"
- **Who made 1-million-year-old tools?** Tools predate known H. floresiensis
- Wrist bones "more closely resembled those of apes than modern humans"
- Mata Menge specimens "even smaller" than Liang Bua
- "Only one relatively complete skeleton and only one skull" despite 100+ fossils
- Sexual dimorphism unknown - "not clear what a male hobbit might have looked like"
- No DNA recovered despite bones being unfossilized

---

16. HOMO SAPIENS (Jebel Irhoud)

Discovery

- Found by miners 1961 in Morocco
- Originally thought to be 40,000-year-old Neanderthals
- New excavations 2004-2017 by Jean-Jacques Hublin's team

Physical Evidence

- 22 fossils from at least 5 individuals

- Partial skulls, jaws, teeth, limb bones
- NOT one complete skull - composite reconstruction

Dating Changes

- 1961: 40,000 years (Neanderthal)
- 1990s: 160,000-200,000 years (archaic H. sapiens)
- 2017: 300,000-315,000 years ("earliest H. sapiens")

Reconstruction

- "Composite reconstruction based on micro computed tomographic scans of MULTIPLE original fossils"
- Nine different reconstructions possible by varying alignment by millimeters
- Not one individual - combined from multiple specimens

Features & Disputes

- "Mosaic of features: facial, mandibular and dental morphology aligns with early/recent modern humans and MORE PRIMITIVE neurocranial and endocranial morphology"
- "Modern-looking face paired with long, low braincase that calls to mind archaic humans"
- "Not all scientists accept premise that Jebel Irhoud fossils belong to H. sapiens"

Scientific Questions

- How is "correct" reconstruction chosen when nine are possible?
- If it's a composite from multiple individuals, which features define H. sapiens?
- With massive redating (40,000 → 300,000 years), how reliable are initial interpretations?

THE CIRCULAR REASONING PROBLEM IN FOSSIL RECONSTRUCTION

Fundamental Logical Issue

To reconstruct something, you must know what it originally looked like. However, if the original appearance is unknown, reconstruction must be based on assumptions about what it SHOULD look like, then that reconstruction is used to "prove" the assumptions were correct.

Scientific Acknowledgment of the Problem

Reconstruction as Art and Assumption:

- "Reconstruction is and will remain an art as much as a science" (Antón & Sánchez, 2004)

- Reconstruction involves "decisions about definite biological and ecological interpretations" including choosing "between a more upright or a more bent posture for the skeleton of an early hominid" (Antón & Sánchez, 2004)

Phylogenetic Inference Circularity:

- "Phylogenetic inferences regarding the fossil taxon are based on the attributes of both the sister group of the fossil taxon and more distantly related clades" (Witmer, 1995)
- "Phylogenetic inference is conservative; only features in related taxa can be inferred in the fossil" (Witmer, 1995)
- This means: ASSUME evolutionary relationships → USE assumptions to fill missing parts → CLAIM reconstruction "proves" the relationships

Biased Assimilation:

- "Biased assimilation refers to the process by which new information is interpreted in a way that aligns with preexisting assumptions and expectations" (Lord & Taylor, 2009)
- "Participants typically find evidence that is consistent with their prior beliefs more convincing than evidence that is inconsistent with their prior beliefs" (Jern et al., 2014)

Sensitivity to Missing Data:

- "Just two missing characters interpreted as absent causes significantly low phylogenetic placement of taxa" (Sansom, 2015)
- "Such positioning will have massive ramifications for our understanding of the phylogenetic placements of fossils" (Sansom, 2015)
- Only TWO miscoded features can make a fossil appear "artificially primitive"

Circular Dating Acknowledged:

- "The main evidence for evolution—the fossil record—involves a serious case of circular reasoning. The fossil evidence depends on geological ages of rocks, however rocks are assigned ages based on fossil assemblages, and fossils are arranged based on assumed evolutionary relationships—thus the main evidence for evolution is based on the assumption of evolution" (Morris, 1974)
- "More and more modern geologists are now recognizing the existence of circular reasoning in their geological methodologies" (O'Rourke, 1976)
- "Stratigraphy cannot avoid this kind of reasoning if it insists on using only temporal concepts, because circularity is inherent in the derivation of time scales" (O'Rourke, 1976)

Application to Specific Specimens

Jebel Irhoud (Homo sapiens):

- Nine different reconstructions possible by varying alignment by millimeters
- Composite reconstruction from multiple individuals
- Which reconstruction is "correct" depends on assumptions about what Homo sapiens "should" look like

Ardipithecus ramidus ("Ardi"):

- 100+ fragments assembled over 15 years
- Pelvis "reconstructed from crushed specimen"
- Requires knowing original shape to reconstruct—but original shape is unknown

Sahelanthropus tchadensis:

- Skull crushed and distorted
- Reconstruction requires assumptions about original shape
- Different assumptions yield different interpretations (ape vs. hominin)

Lucy (AL 288-1):

- Composite from 47 bone fragments
- Included baboon vertebra for 40 years
- Assembly requires assumptions about which pieces belong together

The Logical Problem

1. **Assume** what the organism should look like (based on evolutionary expectations)
2. **Reconstruct** missing/damaged parts based on those assumptions
3. **Use** the reconstruction to "prove" the original assumptions
4. **Present** as "evidence" for evolution

This is circular reasoning: using assumptions to create evidence to prove the assumptions.

PATTERNS IDENTIFIED ACROSS ALL DISCOVERIES

Pattern 1: Fragmentary Evidence

- Sahelanthropus: 6 fossils, crushed skull
- Orrorin: 20 fossils, "few body parts"
- A. kadabba: 19 specimens, "teeth and bits"
- A. ramidus: 100+ fragments requiring 15 years assembly

- Lucy: 47 fragments, ~40% skeleton
- First Family: 250+ fragments from multiple individuals
- H. habilis: Partial skulls, fragmentary remains
- H. erectus: Separated finds, lost originals (Peking)
- Neanderthal: Initial specimen partial
- Denisovan: ONE finger bone, TWO teeth
- H. heidelbergensis: ONE jawbone
- H. georgicus: Jaw found 5 years before matching skull
- H. ergaster: Turkana Boy 40% complete, "bones from one side tell other side"
- H. antecessor: 170 specimens but type specimen is juvenile
- H. floresiensis: "Only one relatively complete skeleton and only one skull" from 100+ fossils
- H. sapiens (Jebel): 22 fossils from 5+ individuals, composite reconstruction

Pattern 2: Mixed Deposits & Surface Finds

- Sahelanthropus: Femur and jaw 2.5km from skull, "may have been transported and reburied"
- Orrorin: Fossils from 4 different sites
- A. kadabba: Toe bone 16km away, different age
- Lucy: Surface find after rainstorm, mixed with animal bones
- First Family: Scattered hillside, disarticulated
- H. erectus: Java skull and femur 15m apart, found 1 year apart
- H. heidelbergensis: Found with elephant and rhino bones in river deposit
- H. georgicus: Found under saber-toothed cat skeleton
- H. antecessor: "Remains accumulated by geological processes," debris flow and floodplain facies
- H. floresiensis: Bones "consistency of wet blotting paper," had to dry before excavation

Pattern 3: Dating Challenges & Changes

- Sahelanthropus: Biochronology only, pieces "may have been reburied in modern times"
- Jebel Irhoud: 40,000 → 160,000 → 300,000 years
- H. habilis: Multiple redating events
- H. erectus: Wide range of dates, significant controversy
- H. georgicus: 1.2-1.8 Ma → 1.77-1.85 Ma

- H. antecessor: 800,000-900,000 → 772,000-949,000 years; new find challenges species entirely
- H. floresiensis: 38,000-13,000 → 100,000-60,000 years (massive revision 2016)
- Various specimens: Reliance on volcanic layer dating with assumptions

Pattern 4: Preservation Problems

- Sahelanthropus: "Badly crushed," "difficult to interpret"
- A. ramidus: "Crushed nearly to smithereens"
- A. kadabba: "Fragmentary nature"
- Lucy: Included baboon bone for 40 years
- First Family: Completely disarticulated
- H. habilis OH 24: "Crushed flat"
- H. erectus Peking: All originals LOST, only casts remain
- H. ergaster: Turkana Boy missing feet and humerus, "only upper portion of orbits protruding"
- H. floresiensis: "Consistency of wet blotting paper," unfossilized, had to dry before excavation

Pattern 5: Extensive Reconstruction Required

- Sahelanthropus: Crushed skull reconstructed
- A. ramidus: 15 years to reconstruct from crushed fragments
- H. habilis: "Heavily reconstructed"
- H. georgicus: Jaw and skull found 5 years apart, had to match later
- H. floresiensis: Bones had to dry first, only 1 complete skull from 100+ fossils
- H. sapiens (Jebel): Composite from multiple individuals, nine possible reconstructions
- All require assumptions about original appearance to reconstruct

Pattern 6: Species Definition Disputes

- Sahelanthropus: "Difficult to determine whether hominin or ape"
- Orrorin: Bipedalism "debate remains unresolved"
- A. kadabba: "Not enough evidence"
- A. ramidus: "Not sufficient anatomical evidence"
- H. habilis: "Validity as distinct species is controversial," may be multiple species or Australopithecus
- H. erectus: May represent multiple species
- Neanderthal: Could be ancient human variation

- H. heidelbergensis: "No consensus," "muddle in the middle," "does not belong to immediate ancestral line"
- H. georgicus: "Classification controversial and disputed" - separate species? subspecies? or just H. erectus?
- H. ergaster: "Not everyone accepts this species name, some prefer African Homo erectus"
- H. antecessor: "Highly debated with many considering remains to be Homo heidelbergensis"; 2022 find contradicts species
- H. floresiensis: "Origin disputed" - dwarfed H. erectus OR primitive H. habilis/Australopithecus descendant?
- H. sapiens (Jebel): "Not all scientists accept" classification

---

23 LEGITIMATE SCIENTIFIC QUESTIONS

Discovery Context:

1. When fossils are found by miners, road workers, or discovered on surface after rainstorms, how is their original context determined?
2. If bones from different locations (2.5km-16km apart) are assigned to the same species, what criteria confirm they belong together?
3. When original fossils are lost (Peking Man) and only casts remain, how reliable are subsequent analyses?

Dating & Temporal Issues:

4. When specimens are redated with changes of 260,000+ years (Jebel Irhoud: 40,000→300,000), how does this affect confidence in initial interpretations?
5. If pieces "may have been transported and reburied in modern times," how are original dates determined?
6. When a supposed ancestor (A. ramidus) may be younger than its supposed descendant (Australopithecus), what does this indicate about the phylogeny?

Association & Identification:

7. If a baboon vertebra was misidentified as Lucy's spine for 40 years, what other bones might be misattributed?
8. When the Mauer jaw (H. heidelbergensis) was found with elephant and rhinoceros bones, could it be from an extinct ape (as Piltdown was an orangutan jaw accepted for 40 years)?
9. How are disarticulated bones from "minimum 9-17 individuals" at one site assigned to specific individuals?

Reconstruction & Circular Reasoning:

10. When reconstructing crushed/distorted fossils, how do researchers determine the original shape without already knowing what it should look like?

11. If reconstruction requires assumptions about what the organism "should" look like based on evolutionary expectations, how can the reconstruction then be used as evidence for those same expectations?
12. With nine different reconstructions possible for Jebel Irhoud by varying alignment by millimeters, how is the "correct" reconstruction determined?
13. When only two miscoded features can make a fossil appear "artificially primitive," how reliable are reconstructions from highly fragmentary specimens?

Species Classification:

14. If there is "not enough evidence due to fragmentary nature" for multiple specimens, how are species determinations made?
15. When experts disagree on whether specimens represent distinct species or variation within species, what criteria resolve these disputes?

Overall Methodology:

16. How do we distinguish between true evolutionary relationships and apparent relationships created by fragmentary evidence, reconstruction choices, and dating assumptions?
17. When similar patterns of fragmentary evidence, mixed deposits, and reconstruction requirements appear across all specimens, how confident can we be in the interpretations?
18. If index fossils are dated by rock layers, and rock layers are dated by index fossils, how is this circular reasoning resolved?
19. When the "common ancestor" (Homo heidelbergensis) is based on one jawbone with no consensus on its classification, how reliable is the entire phylogenetic framework?
20. If reconstruction methodology inherently involves circular reasoning (using assumptions to create evidence to prove those assumptions), how can reconstructions be considered objective scientific evidence?
21. When variation at a single site (Dmanisi) is "so large that had specimens been found at different sites they would be classified as different species," how many proposed species are actually just normal variation?
22. If "many hominin fossils formerly thought to be different species may not have been separate species at all," how reliable are species determinations based on fragmentary evidence?
23. When authorities remove fossils from repositories (H. floresiensis case), how does this affect scientific integrity and independent verification?

CONCLUSION

This investigation reveals consistent methodological patterns across all examined specimens from claimed human ancestors spanning 7 million years to 40,000 years ago, including **16 proposed species** and our own species (Homo sapiens):

- **Fragmentary Evidence**: Most specimens consist of incomplete remains, often heavily fragmented
- **Mixed Deposits**: Many discoveries involve bones from multiple individuals or mixed with other species
- **Dating Challenges**: Multiple redating of specimens with significant age changes, reliance on assumptions
- **Preservation Issues**: Crushing, distortion, and degradation affecting interpretation
- **Reconstruction Requirements**: Extensive reconstruction needed, often from crushed/distorted specimens
- **Species Definition Disputes**: Ongoing scientific disagreement about classification and relationships
- **Circular Reasoning**: Reconstruction methodology relies on assumptions about what specimens "should" look like, then uses those reconstructions to "prove" the assumptions—a fundamental logical problem acknowledged in the scientific literature

The circular reasoning problem is particularly significant: to reconstruct a fossil, one must know its original appearance, but when that appearance is unknown, reconstructions are based on evolutionary expectations, which are then "confirmed" by the reconstruction itself.

These patterns raise legitimate questions about the certainty of interpretations and the strength of evidence for claimed evolutionary relationships.

THE TIMELINE PROBLEM: INSUFFICIENT TIME FOR GRADUAL EVOLUTION

Scientific Estimates for Speciation Duration

According to evolutionary theory, species formation requires substantial time:

- "In birds and mammals, a split between well-developed species is normally like a million years old" (Andersson, 2022)
- "Speciation generally requires the accumulation of mutations over 2 million years" across vertebrates, arthropods and plants (Molecular Biology and Evolution study, 50,000+ species)
- "Maximum duration of speciation of around 1 million years based on the difference between divergence times of sister species" (Curnoe et al., 2006)

The Compressed Timeframe Issue

Examining the dates of proposed species reveals a critical problem:

HALF of these "species" occur within a 500,000-year window:

- H. antecessor: 772,000-949,000 years ago
- H. heidelbergensis: ~600,000 years ago

- H. floresiensis: 60,000-190,000 years ago
- Neanderthal: 40,000-400,000 years ago

Others clustered within 1.5-2 million year range:

- H. georgicus: 1.77-1.85 million years ago
- H. ergaster: 1.5-1.9 million years ago
- H. erectus: 1.9 million years ago

The Logical Problem: If speciation requires 1-2 million years of gradual change, but these "species" are separated by only 200,000-500,000 years, there is insufficient time for one to evolve from another through gradual processes.

What the Fossil Record Actually Shows

The scientific literature acknowledges:

- "The fossil record of an evolutionary progression typically consists of species that suddenly appear, and ultimately disappear, hundreds of thousands or millions of years later, without any change in external appearance" (Wikipedia: Speciation)
- "During each species' existence new species appear at random intervals, each also lasting many hundreds of thousands of years before disappearing without a change in appearance"
- "The exact relatedness of these concurrent species is generally impossible to determine" (Wikipedia: Speciation)

Key Observations:

- Species appear **suddenly** in the record
- They **coexist** for hundreds of thousands of years
- They show **no change** during their existence
- Their evolutionary relationships are "**impossible to determine**"

The Dmanisi Evidence

The variation found at the single Dmanisi site directly challenges species distinctions:

- "Variation so large that had they been discovered at different sites, they most likely would have been classified as different species" (Lordkipanidze et al., 2013)
- "The differences between these Dmanisi fossils are no more pronounced than those between five modern humans or five chimpanzees" (Lordkipanidze, 2013)
- "Many hominin fossils formerly thought to be different species may not have been separate species at all" (Dmanisi skull 5 analysis)

The Two Evolutionary Models Both Face Problems

1. Phyletic Gradualism (slow, steady change):

- Predicts gradual transformation over millions of years
- **Problem:** Fossil record doesn't show gradual transitions, and timeframes are too short

2. Punctuated Equilibrium (long stasis, rapid bursts):

- Proposed specifically because gradualism doesn't match fossil evidence
- Species remain unchanged for long periods, then rapid speciation events
- **Problem:** Essentially abandons gradual evolution when it doesn't fit the evidence

Logical Conclusion

Given that:

1. Evolutionary speciation requires 1-2 million years of gradual change
2. Many proposed "species" are dated within 200,000-500,000 years of each other
3. The fossil record shows they coexisted rather than succeeding one another
4. Variation at single sites (Dmanisi) equals or exceeds variation between "species"

The evidence suggests:

- These specimens could not have evolved from each other (insufficient time)
- They represent contemporary populations showing normal variation
- What are classified as "separate species" may be variation within the same species or related species living at the same time
- The assumption of ancestor-descendant relationships may be unwarranted

Question: If gradual evolution over millions of years is the mechanism, but the proposed species appear suddenly, coexist in compressed timeframes, and show variation comparable to modern populations, are these truly evolutionary ancestors or simply contemporary species exhibiting normal biological diversity?

Note: This document presents factual information from peer-reviewed scientific sources and official institutional publications. All claims are supported by citations from the scientific literature. The investigation examines **16 proposed human ancestor/relative species** from the earliest claimed ancestors (7 million years) through to Homo sapiens, applying consistent methodology to evaluate discovery context, physical evidence, dating methods, preservation issues, and scientific disputes.