

Actually, it may not be very important to know how old the australopithecine fossils are, since there is no real evidence that Homo erectus and Homo sapiens were derived from genus Australopithecus. Some of the reasons we can say there is no real evidence for evolution from genus Australopithecus to genus Homo are:

(1) The difference in anatomical form of the bones of these two fossil groups. This includes a great contrast in cranial capacity in relation to the size of the entire skeleton, as well as in the shape of many cranial and other bones. Many of the popular articles and books concerning these fossils say that the two groups (genera) are very similar, but if one reads the original scientific descriptions of them, he finds that the popular claims are not true.

t: (2) The total lack of definite cultural artifacts in association with the australopithecine fossils. This is true even of the famous "Lucy" skeleton--in spite of all the fanciful, popularizing talk about her supposed (but very few) human-like characteristics. Roger Lewin, in Bones of Contention, 1987, p. 279, states that the "tools" which are sometimes spoken of as belonging to the "Lucy" culture were not discovered until 1976, two years after the excavation of the "Lucy" skeleton site. These were only very crude "pebble" tools" (see explanation above) and were only from the same general geographic and geologic location as the "Lucy" remains.

(3) The enormous lack (scarcity) of fossils and other data which might point to an evolutionary relationship between the genus Australopithecus and genus Homo. We should remember the fact that the "Lucy" skeleton (classified as Australopithecus