

# “The Man From Monkey Myth”

by  
DOUGLAS DEWAR

Part of the  
*Jimmie Beller Memorial eLibrary*  
[www.TheCobbSix.com](http://www.TheCobbSix.com)

Nearly one hundred years ago W. R. Broderip, F.R.S., in the chapter 'Apes and Monkeys' of his *Zoological Recreations*, wrote:

'Tailed or tailless, this amusing order of mammiferous animals has always been, and ever will be, regarded by the million with feelings of mingled interest and disgust. Every one is irresistibly attracted by the appearance and tricks of a monkey—very few leave the scene without something like mortified pride at the caricature held up to them. The zoologist regards the family with an interest proportioned to their approximation to man; but he knows that their apparent similarity to the human form vanishes before anatomical investigation; and that, although there may be some points of resemblance, the distance between the bimanous and the quadrumanous types, notwithstanding all the ingenious arguments of those philosophers who support the theory of a gradual development from a monad to man, is great.

'We would treat with respect such names as Lamarck, Bory de Saint Vincent—ay, and others, even unto Monboddo, through the announcement of the last will handily be received by any naturalist with gravity; but we must beg leave to differ from them *toto caelo*. Leaving the tail out of the question, there is no doubt that the number and quality of the teeth in some species are identical with the formula belonging to the human subject; and there may be as little that the peasants of the Landes of Aquitaine, who gain their living by climbing for the resin of the *Pinus Maritima*, have acquired a power of opposing, in a certain degree, the great toe to the others; but these facts are, after all, but traps for the unwary.'

While Broderip was penning this passage the unwary Darwin was heading for these and other like traps, and, before twenty-five years had passed, he, Huxley, Haeckel and scores of other zoologists were well and truly caught in them; and most of their successors are likewise trapped. Just as the fox of the fable that lost its tail, tried, by proclaiming that this loss is a great gain, to induce other foxes to rid themselves of their tails, so have Darwin and his followers endeavoured to entice others into their traps by proclaiming that it is far better to be a risen ape than a fallen man.<sup>1</sup> Those who refuse to become entrapped are dubbed savages by

---

<sup>1</sup> Each of Darwin's victims, craving companionship, tries to entice others into the particular trap in which he is caught. Various baits are used, e.g., Pithecanthropus, Dryopithecus, Sivapithecus, Australopithecus, Propithecus, Simia, a lemuroid, a tarsioid, ape-like stock, a generalised ape, a generalised Primate, a generalised mammal, three different kinds of ape, four different kinds of ape, five different kinds of ape. All these and others have been put forth as the ancestors or near ancestor of man. In this

Darwin, who cries (*Descent of Man*, p. 927): ‘He who is not content to look, like a savage, at the phenomena of nature as disconnected, cannot any longer believe that man is the work of a separate act of creation.’<sup>2</sup> The oft-repeated assertion that Darwin never said that man is descended from an ape or monkey is incorrect. Here are Darwin’s words (*op. cit.*, p. 239).

‘A naturalist would undoubtedly have ranked as an ape or a monkey an ancient form which possessed many characters in an intermediate condition, and some few, perhaps, distinct from those found in either group. And as man from a genealogical point of view belongs to the Catarrhine or Old World stock, we must conclude, however much the conclusion may revolt our pride, that our early progenitors would have been properly thus designated.’

It is but just to say that not everyone who believes man to be derived from a non-human ancestor, deems that ancestors to have been an ape. Some, notably Professor F. Wood Jones, would derive man from a kind of Tarsier. Such are unacceptable to most transformists. Thus Professor E. A. Hooten writes (*Up from the Ape*, p. 105): ‘I find it easier to believe and more palatable to swallow the theory that man has evolved from some brutal arboreal ape, than from a pop-eyed, swivel-necked, rat-like tarsiod.’ But, not matter what view be held of the origin of man, the exercise of a little intelligence should convince anyone that none of man’s ancestors can have had any of the following characters.

(1) A hairy coat to which the young could cling, thus allowing the mother full use of all four limbs for locomotion.

(2) Quadrupedal gait.

(3) An opposable great toe.

Let us consider these. As to the hairy coat, Darwin must have realised that, if this were lost, this must have happened in spite of Natural Selection. Instead of admitting this, he suggests to his readers that the

---

connection Professor H. H. Woollard writes (*Science Progress*, July, 1938): ‘When a new fossil has been discovered, the discoverer has been unable to resist the temptation of asserting that his fossil, if apelike, presented all sorts of human characters, and, if human and clearly modern in character, it possessed all sorts of simian characters, more or less hidden and elucidated only by minute examination.’

<sup>2</sup> By similar reasoning Darwin’s *Origin of Species* should be regarded as having spontaneously generated itself out of ink and paper, and having automatically begotten Darwin’s later books; for to suppose them to have been connected by mere intelligence, and to believe that every letter in every word in these voluminous productions had been specially formed would, on Darwinian principles, have been simply barbaric.

loss took place in the tropics. He writes (*op. cit.*, p. 86):

‘Mr. Belt believes that within the tropics it is an advantage to man to be destitute of hair, as he is thus enabled to free himself of the multitude of ticks (*acari*) and other parasites, with which he is often infested, and which sometimes cause ulceration. But whether this evil is of sufficient magnitude to have led to the denudation of his body by Natural Selection may be doubted, since none of the many quadrupeds inhabiting the tropics have, so far as I know, acquired any specialized means of relief. The view which seems to me the most probable is that man, or rather primarily woman, became divested of hair for ornamental purposes, as we shall see under Sexual Selection; and, according to this belief, it is not surprising that man should differ so greatly in hairiness from all other Primates, for characters, gained through Sexual Selection, often differ to an extraordinary degree in closely related forms.’

Darwin here ignores the fact that the main function of the body hair of apes and monkeys is to provide a kind of mat to which the young clings when carried by the mother, allowing her full use of all four limbs for brachiation or other form of locomotion. The young New World monkey hangs on to the back hair of the mother; young Old World monkeys and apes cling to the hair of the mother’s underparts. Le Vaillant records that he shot, in British Guiana, a monkey carrying a young one on its back. The youngster, which was not injured by the shot, continued to cling to its mother’s dead body while this was being taken to the camp. In order to tear it away Le Vaillant had to get the help of a negro. When disentangled the young one made a dart for a peruke on a wooden block. It embraced the peruke with all four hands and could not be induced to quit it for four weeks.<sup>3</sup>

Now consider the case of a species of ape of which the body hair grew gradually shorter and finer. The shorter the hair became the more difficult it would be for the young to hang on and the greater would be the mortality resulting from them falling to the ground when the mother was moving fast; and *ex hypothesi* Natural Selection would prevent the shortest-haired females rearing young, for, said Darwin (*Origin of Species*, p. 63): ‘We may be sure that any variation in the least degree injurious would be rigidly destroyed.’ The only way in which the unfortu-

---

<sup>3</sup> To provide a baby orangoutang, captured in Borneo, with something to cling to, A. R. Wallace made out of a piece of buffalo hide an artificial mother, but he had to remove this because the young orang, in its efforts to extract milk therefrom, was nearly choked by the hair it swallowed.

nate species of which the body hair was becoming progressively shorter could avoid extinction would be for mothers to take to using one of their limbs to hold the young one. As this would allow only three limbs for locomotion, the mothers when fleeing from enemies would be sorely handicapped and so be eliminated by Natural Selection.

The foregoing considerations show why Darwin made Sexual Selection responsible for the nudity of man. He promised that when speaking of Sexual Selection he would explain how this feat was accomplished. But those who turn to the part of the book on Sexual Selection for enlightenment will find no mention of the matter. This is particularly disappointing because of Darwin's assertion that 'primarily woman became devoid of hair for ornamental purposes' does not tally with his oft-repeated declaration that Sexual Selection modifies the male rather than the female, owing to the greater and more promiscuous 'eagerness' of the male who 'usually accepts any female' (*Descent of Man*, pp. 348, 640, 683, 796, 825). In this case there was no reason why Sexual Selection should cause the female to lose her hair, such loss not being necessary for her to attract males, but there was every reason why Natural Selection should operate to prevent the loss of the hair so greatly needed for the carrying of her young. Darwin evidently found himself in difficulty. He could hardly expect to be believed if he asserted that the prohominid male suddenly acquired an aesthetic preference for short-haired females, and had an eye keen enough to distinguish between one of which the average length of the body hair was, say, 13 mm., and one whose hair measured 12 mm., and mated only with the latter, so that the body hair of the female became progressively shorter until eventually the present nude condition was reached.

Nor could Darwin, even though fortified by his belief that acquired characters are inherited, assert that, just as girls today pluck their eyebrows to attract men, so did the female prohominids heroically pluck the whole body, because human beings have many body hairs, probably as many as anthropoid apes have, but the human hairs are very much shorter and finer. Neither of these theories accounts for the nakedness of the males. Darwin, profiting by our ignorance of the laws of inheritance, asserted that the characters acquired by one sex as the result of Sexual Selection are transmitted to the other sex, but, even so, he had to explain how the naked females contrived to transmit to the males long beards, moustaches and whiskers which they themselves lacked. These troublesome male ornaments also made it difficult for Darwin to change his theory by asserting that the males were the first to be denuded because

the females suddenly acquired a predilection for naked males, for, in that case, he would have had to tell us why Natural Selection permitted the males to transmit their nudity to the females and so deprive them of their means of carrying the young. He would also have been up against Natural Selection had he asserted that the males and females acquired their nakedness contemporaneously, either by mutual selection, or by plucking or scratching off their own hair, or that of the opposite sex. No wonder, then, that Darwin did not fulfill his promise to show us how mankind lost the hairy coat. So does Darwin's theory that Sexual Selection brought about the nudity of mankind collapse, and with it the theory that man's ancestors had a coat of long hair.

Because human hair neither keep man warm nor provide a mat to which young babies can cling, Darwin's followers imagine that they are useless structures. The learned authors of *Science of Life*—H. G. and G. P. Wells and Julian Huxley—make the following pronouncement (p. 410):

The body hair of men and women is purely vestigial, it no longer serves to prevent us losing heat. And yet each of these tens of thousands of useless hairs possesses a useless muscle by means of which it can be quite uselessly raised.'

The truth is that these hairs have an important function. Each is embedded in a follicle into which opens the duct of at least one sebaceous gland secreting an oily fluid necessary to keep the skin in good condition. These hairs and the muscles attached to them—the *arrectores pilorum*—have a twofold function. The muscles, which are situated on the side of the hair toward which it slopes, on contraction diminish the obliquity of the hair follicle and render the hair more erect, and, at the same time, compress the sebaceous glands and expel their contents (Cunningham, *Text Book of Anatomy* (1902), p. 733). The presence of the hair and its movements also prevent the mouth of the follicle from becoming blocked with sebaceous matter. Follicles which have lost their hair sometimes become blocked and this may result in the formation of a sebaceous cyst.

The citation of these human body hairs as useless vestiges is largely due to the fact that, as knowledge increases, the evidence for evolution diminishes. In view of the difficulty of procuring good evidence of evolution, transformists make much of structures deemed by them to be useless vestiges of organs that were formerly useful. About fifty years ago an arch-transformist named Wiedersheim asserted that there are in the human body no fewer than 180 of these vestiges which are 'almost or

wholly useless.’<sup>4</sup> The authors of the *Science of Life* quote this, adding (p. 410) ‘each one of them is a stumbling-block to the believer in Special Creation but an ally to the evolutionist.’ In fact it is open to doubt whether there exists in any animal a structure which is neither useful to it at some period of its life nor formed because every embryo at an early stage of development exhibits the primordia of all the structures found in the class to which it belongs, including both male and female organs in animals that are not hermaphrodite.<sup>5</sup>

Some of the useless vestiges cited by the authors of the *Science of Life* are supposed to date back to the time when man’s ancestors were fishes! Thus they write (p. 1127):

‘The smell cells in the nose . . . are definitely fishy and will only work if they are immersed in water, so we find, in an out-of-the-way corner of the cavity of the nose, a special set of little glands, evolved when the vertebrates came on dry land, whose business it is to secrete a film of moisture over the small cells—a tiny vestigial sea for them to work in.’

Dr. R. E. D. Clark, who is a chemist, thus comments (*Trans. Victoria Institute*, Vol. LXXI, p. 182):

‘Anyone with some elementary knowledge of chemistry knows that reactions do not occur save in liquids—except at an incredibly small speed. The reason why the sense of smell is connected with liquid is chemical—there is no need to appeal to evolution.’

The functions of some of the useless vestiges of Messrs. Wells and Huxley are described by Vialleton on pp. 163-167 of his *L’Origine des Etres vivants. L’Illusion transformiste*. Fifteen editions of this book were sold within three years of publication, nevertheless no publisher approached in this country was willing to incur the risk of issuing an English translation. One of the supposed vestiges not dealt with by Vialleton is thus described in the *Science of Life* (p. 411):

‘The little fleshy fold in the inner angle of our eye . . . seems to have no function whatever; but in most lower vertebrates, including many mammals such as cats, this same fold is a veritable third eyelid, which can be rapidly swept across the eye from one side to the other. As further

---

<sup>4</sup> The adverb ‘almost’ provides a good line of retreat in case of an attack.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Goodrich (*Encyc. Britannica*, vol. 8, p. 926): ‘It is doubtful whether any really useless parts are ever preserved for long unless they are insignificant, and many of the so-called vestigial organs are now known to fulfil important functions.’ Some structures exist of which the uses are not at present known; but it is premature to assert that these are useless.

proof of man's simian relationship it may be noted that apes, and monkeys, too, have their third eyelid reduced to a vestige.'

Man would be in a woeful plight but for this semilunar fold. This is not membranous like an eyelid, but cartilaginous. When dust or other foreign body gets into the eye, tears flow, the eyelids close and muscular movement sweeps the tears, with the foreign particle, toward the inner corner of the eye, where the membranous edge of this fold scoops up the offending object, causing it to pass on to the *caruncula lachrymalis*—a patch of skin in the corner of the eye provided with fine hairs and sebaceous glands. Here the foreign matter becomes a sticky mass which can easily be removed by the finger without harming the eye.<sup>6</sup>

The supposition that man is descended from a quadrupedal ancestor is, I submit, unsustainable. Man's upright posture and gait mark him off very sharply from all other types. The great comparative anatomist, L. Vialleton, goes on so far as to assert (*op. cit.*, p. 281) that man is as far separated from his supposed simian relatives as bats and whales are from all other animals. Professor F. G. Parsons, who is a transformist, writes (*Ency. Brit.*, vol. 15, p. 990): there is 'a greater gap between the musculature of man and that of the other Primates than there is between many different orders.' Darwin did not appreciate this. The change from quadrupedal to bipedal gait presented no difficulty for him. He wrote (*Descent of Man*, p. 78): 'We see . . . in existing monkeys a manner of progression between that of a quadruped and a biped.' This is not so. Monkeys are quadrupedal, but, as they spend most of their time in trees, they are more agile, more supple than creatures which rarely leave the ground. Hence those who derive man from a quadruped naturally assert that this ancestor was a tree-dweller, be it ape, tarsier or lemur. They have to get man's ancestor up a tree. How it got there, how it became transformed from a ground to a tree-dweller, they make no attempt to explain. Darwin starts off with an ape living in the trees and then makes it descend to the ground. Having got it back to *terra firma*, Darwin has to get it on its hind legs. Accordingly he writes (*op. cit.*, p. 76):

---

<sup>6</sup> E. P. Stibbe gives a full account of the process on pp. 159-175 of Vol. LXII of the *Journal of Anatomy*. There is a drawing of the apparatus in Gray's *Anatomy* (p. 591, 9th Edition).

In reptiles, birds and some mammals the eye is cleared of foreign matter by a third eyelid—a semi-transparent membrane below the other eyelids. This, when at rest, is folded up and tucked away in the corner of the eye. By the action of two muscles it can be swept across the eye and so removes obnoxious particles. I cannot see how this third eyelid could be converted into the semilunar fold by degrees.



‘as it became less arboreal ... its habitual manner of progression would have been modified; and thus it would have been rendered more strictly quadrupedal or bipedal . . . Man alone became a biped; and we can, I think, partly see how he has come to assume his erect attitude . . . Man could not have attained his present dominant position . . . without the use of his hands . . . But the hands and arms could not have become perfect enough to have manufactured weapons or to have hurled stones, as long as they were habitually used for locomotion . . . From these causes alone it would have been an advantage to man be become a biped. . . To gain this advantage the feet have been rendered flat; and the great toe has been peculiarly modified, though this has entailed the almost complete loss of its power of prehension.’

What will scientific men of the future think of this poppycock? What a picture Darwin draws of this prohominid, which, with commendable foresight and noble self-denial, abstains from using its forelimbs for locomotion, and suffers agonies in its gallant efforts to balance itself and walk on its hind legs! How its spine, hip-, leg- and foot-bones, to say nothing of the great toes, much have ached while they were being re-conditioned to adapt themselves to erect posture! Nor did these aches and pains entirely cease when, at last, the erect position was acquired. Dr. John Murphy solemnly assures us (*Primitive man*, p. 76):

‘When the upright posture was new to the precursor of man, the necessity for frequent rests from it would be greatly felt.’

Even Natural Selection must have been moved to pity by the plight of this prohominid and so refrained from destroying it; otherwise, according to our evolutionists, man would never have come into being.<sup>7</sup>

We now have to consider the supposed loss of the power of opposing the great toe. The corresponding toe of an ape may be compared to one of the blades of a pair of scissors, the other blade being represented by the remaining toes, these last being bound together by a band of fibres known as the transverse ligament. In man this ligament embraces the great toe as well as the other four, thus the human foot, as compared with that of the ape, is like a pair of scissors so tied that it cannot be opened. The hind limb of the ape is an efficient grasping organ, which the human foot is not.<sup>8</sup> Now, the transverse ligament must either embrace the great

---

<sup>7</sup> In addition to the handicap imposed by the change of gait, the incipient hominid would have suffered from the shortening and weakening of the arms. Baumann’s dynamometer tests showed that a male chimpanzee is 4.4 times and a female chimpanzee 3.6 times as strong as a physically developed fit young man.

<sup>8</sup> In all anthropoid apes and a few monkeys the foot is a more efficient grasping organ

toe, or not embrace it; no intermediate condition is possible. If, then, man be derived from an animal having the great toe opposable, this non-opposability of his great toe must have arisen suddenly, *per saltum*, as a sport. As this would have imposed a great handicap in the struggle for existence, the Darwinist seems compelled to believe that after a definite date almost every individual had this disability, because, had only a few suffered from it, they would have been, in Darwin's words 'rigidly destroyed'; in other words, the loss of opposability must have been a miracle affecting thousands of prohominidae. The theory of evolution is supposed to obviate the necessity for miracles. It does nothing of the sort. It merely substitutes miracles of transformation for those of special creation. The transformist, W. Beebe, writes (*The Bird*, p. 97): 'The idea of miraculous change, which is supposed to be an exclusive prerogative of fairy-tales, is a common phenomenon of evolution.'<sup>9</sup> The fact that the peasants of Landes and some orientals can oppose, to some extent, the big toe to the others is, as Broderip stated, a trap for the unwary. Haeckel caused Darwin to fall into it. The latter writes (*op. cit.*, p. 77): 'With some savages, however, the foot has not altogether lost<sup>10</sup> its prehensile power, as shown by their manner of climbing trees, and of using them (sic) in other ways.'

As Wood Jones points out, in *Man's Place among the Mammals*, the human mobility of the big toe is effected by movement at the metatarsal-phalangeal joint, whereas in the monkey and ape the movement is largely at the saddle-shaped tarso-metatarsal joint.' In less technical language, as the transverse ligament in man binds together the bones of the sole of the foot, the toes jointed on these are capable of a little independent movement varying in extent with the individual, just as the fingers of the hand are. In apes the big toe and the sole bone on which it is hinged can move at the joint with the ankle.

In conclusion, as Vialleton puts it (*op. cit.*, p. 284), 'there is absolute

than the hand. Hartmann, who objected to their feet being called hind hands, had to describe them as prehensile feet.

<sup>9</sup> Professor J. Lefevre writes (*Manuel Critique de Biologie* (1938), p. 35): 'Grace a Haeckel le transformisme est a son apogee. Il a repandu partout sa foi; la parole ardente des maitres entraine irresistiblement les eleves. Dans leur lecons chargees de la mystique nouvelle, il n'est question que d'animaux se battant, s'allongeant, se ramassant, se tordant, se retournant, se pliant, redressant leurs bras, s'ornant d'appendices, se creant des organes, se fabriquant des tentacules et des yeux, se transformant les uns dans les autres, se differentiant et se perfectionnant a volonte: prodiges plus merveilleux et beaufoup plus miraculeux que l'idee creatrice elle-meme.'

<sup>10</sup> Notice the question-begging word 'lost.'

opposition between the attitude and the locomotion of man and those of the apes.’ No amount of wishful thinking or special pleading can dispose of this fact. He criticises a picture drawn by T. H. Huxley, showing a series of skeletons of anthropoid apes and man, all upright or almost so, differing only in size, the dimensions of the cranium and the arms, and a slight inclination of the spinal column.

‘This drawing,’ he writes (*Membres et Seintures des Vertebres tetrapodes*, p. 640), ‘which dissembles the contrast between anthropoids and man, has done much to impress on the minds of the incompetent the notion of perfect continuity between these two groups; it is one of the most striking examples of the schematism so often employed in support of transformist ideas.’

**\* Reprinted by kind permission of Messrs. Constable and Co. Lt., from the issue of ‘The Nineteenth Century and After’ of April 1944.**