



ANCIENT SKIES

"Come Search With Us!"

Official Logbook of the Ancient Astronaut Society

(C) COPYRIGHT 1998 ANCIENT ASTRONAUT SOCIETY - ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

VOLUME 25, NUMBER 2, 1921 ST. JOHNS AVE., HIGHLAND PARK, ILLINOIS 60035-3178 USA

MAY-JUNE, 1998

THE DARWINIAN THEORY AND HUMAN LOCOMOTION

BY THOMAS A. DORMAN, M.D.*

I have come to the impression that modern science has become a "Tower of Babel". Although we all speak English, we do not all speak the same "language". Each of us has his own technical language in each branch of science and we do not communicate. Therefore, it is a great pleasure to be with an audience of people who do not have a fixed perspective in a narrow field. Although we have people from different countries - yes, speaking different languages - the Ancient Astronaut Society is a wonderful environment in which we all do speak the same language of ancient astronauts.

I am not an orthopaedic surgeon, but rather an orthopaedic physician, specializing in managing people with back pain. This distinction is important

*This article is based on the author's presentation at the 24th Anniversary World Conference of the Ancient Astronaut Society held in Orlando, Florida in August 1997. This article is copyrighted (C) 1998 by Thomas A. Dorman, M.D.

Dr. Dorman was born in Nairobi, Kenya in 1936. He attended an Agricultural Secondary School in Israel from 1951 to 1955 and then served for two and one-half years in the Israeli Paratroopers. Returning to Kenya, he served as a coffee firm manager trainee in Nairobi until 1962 and then attended Liverpool University in England for a four year pre-clinical course. He spent the next four years at Edinburgh University, Scotland, specializing in clinical medicine, graduating with M.B and Ch.B degrees in 1965. He is licensed to practice medicine in England, Ireland, Scotland, Canada and in several states of the USA. He currently is engaged in private practice in Kent, Washington, specializing in Internal and Orthopaedic Medicine. An avid researcher and a prolific author of original research papers, he has produced many treatises on chronic back pain, sacroiliac dysfunction, pelvic mechanics and dysfunction, prolotherapy and human locomotion. A member of many prestigious medical organizations, Dr. Dorman has authored many books in his field. He also writes and distributes his own monthly medical newsletter entitled "Fact, Fiction & Fraud in Modern Medicine". For subscription information contact Dorman Publishing, 216 Railroad Ave. N, Kent, WA 98032 USA. Phone 253-854-7050. Fax 253-854-6135. You can contact Dr. Dorman by E mail at: tdorman@nwlink.com or see his web site at <http://www.dormanpub.com>

A videotape of Dr. Dorman's lecture at the Orlando Conference is available in VHS NTSC format only from World Conference Productions, 9090 S.W. 102nd Place, Ocala, FL 34481 USA. For info: E mail: linscott@mercury.net

to you because you can understand how I came to the analysis of the business of human walking. People walk on one leg. Although we think of ourselves as bipeds, we walk on only one leg and merely alternate the stance from one side to another. In order to have this mechanism we have certain characteristics. Bipedal walking is more complex than quadruped walking. As we stand on one leg, the other leg serves as the equivalent of a pendulum. It allows the energy of the swing to go back into the "walking machine" - the human body - as we stride forward.

Of course it is the business of the legs not only to provide swing, but also to provide support, or stance and they alternate. This is in itself dependent on gravity. The longer the pendulum, the slower the swing and it is not surprising that tall people have a slower stride than short people. The elephant has a longer step than the mouse. The mathematical relationship between the length of the limb and the rate of the stride has been calculated and it is called the "frauge number". But from the point of view of the human being, another interesting thing is present - the point of pivot of the pendulum (I am using the pendulum by analogy) is not at its suspension point at the top, but about half way down the pendulum. (This has been described as the "Harrison Pendulum" because it was used in sailing ships). So as we walk we wobble about our pelvis - the strut below the leg alternates with the pendulum, which is the swing leg, and the body serves as a counter pendulum - the upper part of the pendulum and it wobbles back and forth in the direction opposite to the leg. The whole process of advancement of forward walking needs to be subtracted from the pendula alternating movement. This is evident when you watch a person walk on a treadmill, or on one of these belts provided in airports. The body bobs back and forth in opposite direction to the leg. The mechanics of walking can be summarized as a controlled fall, the swing leg is a pendulum, the trunk of the body is a counter pendulum and some anti-gravity energy is restored in the next step.

The other mechanism we have in our body is that of torque. If you watch a person walking from above you will see that the upper girdle swings in the direction opposite to the lower girdle and we all know that the arm swings diagonally alternately with the leg. Why don't we walk like tin soldiers with the same arm moving forward with the leg of the same side? Well, because it's awkward, and the reason it's awkward is because the trunk of the body itself serves as a spring in which the elastic energy is stored and released alternately with the movements. Thus, the shoulders swing with walking, the upper and lower girdles swing in opposite directions, the torque is stored in the spine, and the spring is wound and released with each step.

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

The analogy is the vertical metallic spring of a Black Forest Clock (invented in 1881 in Germany) which shows that energy can be stored and released in a vertical steel spring and the so-called pendulum, which is really a fly-wheel, suspended at the lower half of the clock, releases the energy. By analogy, the human trunk serves the same purpose.

The governing mechanism in the clock is a so-called "anchor escapement", while in the human body it is the facet joints of the spine which serve the same role. So I am proposing that the human being is a walking machine and the qualities of the machine are the storage and release of energy in a rhythmic form, part of the energy anti-gravitational, with the four pendulums (the two small ones are the arms and the two large ones are the legs). Additionally, the body stores energy elastically like a spring with each step that we take and the elasticity is stored in the parts of the body called the ligaments, many of which are in the trunk. The mechanism that is responsible for the release of the energy initiating the movement and regulating the movement is the human spine.

The concept of the storage and release of elastic energy is not that mysterious. A ballerina, for example, stores elastic energy in her legs in the fifth position and this allows her to spring into a greater height when she releases that energy at the moment of her pirouette. A runner crouches and stores elastic energy in his calves to initiate the sprint. So the phenomenon is not mysterious and it is used regularly by every one of us when we walk with every stride.

It is my belief that the pelvis is the pivotal point. Medical students are taught that the pelvis is a fixed ring, except during time of child birth. In fact, we have discovered that the pelvis moves with every stance we take, one iliac bone moves forward and the other moves backward, and the ligaments that bind them are the largest ligaments in the body and are the main springs of the storage of elastic energy. The trunk moves in the opposite direction to the ilium on the affected side. The whole thing is an integrated mechanism and if you have an integrated mechanism you need a transducer, a place where the force can be converted from one form of energy to another, and that, of course, is the human pelvis. The sacroiliac joints and the sacroiliac ligaments are the main transducers of the forces. The sacroiliac ligaments are the main springs of torque, they wind on the stance side and release elastic energy to the swing leg. The ligaments have to be a store of elastic energy.

Walking is more efficient when the arms swing. In a controlled laboratory experiment, we learned that when the body is constricted so that the patient walks on a treadmill without being able to move any parts of the body except the legs, more energy is required. Thus, walking freely with the increased movement of the parts results in a more efficient mechanism with a marked decrease in energy consumption.

Walking by a human being is a characteristic that is unique to our species and it is quite different from the walking of any other creature. The components of human walking include standing basal, shoulder swing, head bobbing, both arms swinging and both legs swinging, and this mechanism results in an efficient mode of walking.

We are taught that the human species has evolved from more primitive creatures - right? Everybody believes that. Human evolution is taken for granted. But I think that when we are faced with situations where we seem to observe paradoxical evidence, the first thing we need to do is to check our premises. Our premise has been that Charles Darwin was correct when speaking about evolution. It is received opinion that the biped human arose from the quadruped, more primitive creature. If one ex-

amines the pelvis of the more primitive creature, such as a goat or a horse, you will see that the sacrum is suspended - suspended from the iliac bones. In the human being, however, the sacrum is wedged between the iliac bones, and when we stand upright it is definitely not freely suspended. I propose to you therefore that the inherent quality of biped walking - really monopod walking alternating the sides - is predicated on a wedged, or locked, sacrum that allows us to have stability and stance and elasticity in swing. This mechanism is qualitatively completely different from the mechanism of a horse or a goat where the sacrum is suspended. In fact, a quadruped walks on three legs and the remaining leg is in transition and becomes a force of support later on.

If you follow the Darwinian perspective you will believe that the survival of the fittest is dependent obviously on the efficiency of the organism. We ordinarily are presented with pictures of a transitional form of a human being, or a pre-human being, as stooped over. The mechanics of being stooped over is inefficient and I am proposing that a transitional form from the quadruped to the biped position would be inherently non-survivable in the concept of survival of the fittest, and therefore is not a practical possibility. The usual illustrations of a stooped creature - I sometimes joke and say "you can't have a transition between four legs and two legs - what are you going to have, a tripod?" In other words, it is mechanically impossible. The dysfunctions we see in the joints are multiple. Only when the system functions in a pristine orderly way does it function well, and there are many forms of dysfunction of the pelvis.

I am proposing to you then that the human pelvis is unique and I mean that in the literal sense - it is qualitatively different from the pelvis of all other creatures. Humans walk erect, balance on one leg, the legs alternate in stance and stride, there is brace and swing, and the locomotor forces are transferred through the pelvis. We stand on one leg and we alternate our stance from one sacroiliac joint from one leg to the other and the role of the human pelvis is one of support vertically. Natives in southwest Africa carry their heavy burdens on their heads. The greatest efficiency in the human structure is when the extra weight is carried within the mechanism of support, which is the vertical support. People have done studies comparing the carriage of weight on the head versus on the back or on the buttock and the carrying of the weight on the head is more efficient because it is in line with the unique human mechanism of walking.

So what I am proposing to you is that this research in this area of medicine which interests us led me to understand that the concepts of uniformitarianism, which was presented to us in the middle of the last century by Charles Lyell, and its lesser brother, the Darwinian concepts, are erroneous. While talking about Charles Darwin, we need to make an additional point. The term evolution contains within it two separate concepts - first, that species change over time and second, that the mechanism whereby changes occur is predicated on natural selections of survival of the fittest. It is only since that time that these two concepts have been merged, and it was surprising to me that George Orwell did not light on that as an example of the disappearance of concepts of words, so that I think that although we are inventing a lot of new terminology, we are losing concepts. And I think it is important to separate it in this regard. I believe that the two notions of Lyell and Darwin are taken for granted by many of us and we unconsciously think in these terms.

Suppose I were to propose to you that the human species could not and therefore did not evolve from the more primitive creature; that it has been on

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Earth for a very long time, or has been in the universe for a very long time. The whole of our problems that we have been discussing in the Ancient Astronaut Society disappear. So I started looking back a little bit at the concepts which Charles Darwin introduced in 1859 and amongst other things he said that of the transitional forms which should be present between the species, 150 of the transitional forms were missing in the paleontological record (the so-called "missing links"), but that they will be found if we look long enough. Well, 140 years have passed since that hypothesis was made and not a single transitional form was found. In fact, we are discovering more areas where transitional form is absent and therefore, its absence denies the premise. And from my own research it is not conceivable that the biped organism arose from a quadruped one.

Essentials of Darwinism are that small steps lead to large steps, or that microevolution leads to macroevolution. The essentials of Neo-Darwinism concepts are that non-living leads to living; that there was once a spontaneous generation of life; that all viruses, bacteria, plants and animals are interrelated; that all invertebrates are interrelated; and that fish gave rise to amphibia, to reptiles to birds and mammals. And in every one of these points there are missing links and incompatibilities in the notion of an evolutionary process. In fact, a scientific hypothesis, by its nature, has to be subject to an experiment which could disprove it, and only in the absence of disproof need we accept it as reality. That is the difference between fairy tales, religion and so on, on the one hand, and science on the other. So I propose to you that the Darwinian concept is unprovable. If that statement is acceptable to you we need now ask: why is it so prevalent in scientific circles? Why is it engrained into our subconsciousness so deeply. I have drawn the following conclusions as to why this phenomenon is occurring in our society as a political agenda:

- humans are animals
- managing the herd is O.K.
- Humanism will replace Christianity
- Science has become a tool of disinformation

I cannot find a better explanation for why the illogicality of the majority is imposed on us all.

In the paleontological record, there is an absence of evolution in the transitional forms, but we do see examples of the stability of the species. For instance, alligators have been the same throughout the whole of the paleontological record. If we begin to look at the business of natural selection and mutation from a genetic perspective, we will soon encounter that in fact a process of natural selection and random mutation leads to the stability of species and does not lead to diversity.

Another phenomenon I want to speak about is that of parallel evolution. If you look at the evolutionary record there are many examples of a similar organ being developed separately in different circumstances. There are in biology 150 paradoxes, none of which lend themselves to a possible mechanical explanation. For example, some small mammals have developed "wings", completely independent of birds; lungs of mammals are of an end tube type, whereas the lungs of birds have a through-tube arrangement. It is inconceivable that a mechanism could switch between the two.

If you look at the phenomenon of genetics, natural selection preserves species and does not cause diversion. The concept of intermediate form is ridiculous. Examples of transitional impossibilities are limbs growing from fins, quadruped changing to bipedal walking, walking to flying and the appearance of sex.

So we are left then with the seduction of the similarity of appearances. The pelvis of the monkey, for example, has some similarity to the pelvis

of the human being and this is the common origin of the Darwinian explanation. There are similarities in developing embryos and in certain genetics, but I propose to you that the similarities can also be explained due to similarities in the circumstances in which the creatures need to function, and they are also limited by carbon chemistry. Therefore, the assumption, as propounded by Darwinism, that similarity represents a common origin is an extremely simplistic one, has no basis in logic and we have a fair amount of evidence against it.

I propose to you that if we start looking at specific instances of anatomy, ontogeny, physiology, bio-chemistry and genetics, we find that the official explanation that the human being is part of a short term, evolving biota - biological creatures on this planet - the evidence does not stand up and I think that the concept that human beings and that life have been around for extremely long periods, which is invariant, has a great deal of support. There are separate lines of evidence which tend to support these concepts: that certain creatures have evolved from human beings, and that the simplistic explanation of Darwinians is erroneous. I think that these concepts contribute to the Ancient Astronaut Society's perspective that things are not what they seem to be and that the evidence that you are unearthing probably has a basis in reality, and those who tell you that it could not have happened because human beings did not exist at the time when various archaeological events seem to have occurred, is simply based on false premises which are fashionable in modern science, but are probably incorrect.

If it is true that man and intelligent creatures have inhabited the Earth in periods which by an order of magnitude antedate the evolution of man and yet there were humanoids, we are facing a paradox. This is one of the two main reasons why the concepts of the Ancient Astronaut Society are not accepted widely, in my opinion. It cannot be, therefore it was not - never mind the evidence. This is the argument that we hear. Well, we have good evidence and many of the members of the Society have unearthed good evidence for extremely ancient humanoid forms acting in an intelligent way on this planet, and by implication, elsewhere in the universe. So it did happen. So how are the two perspectives made compatible? I am answering that the concepts of uniformitarianism and evolution are wrong.

ERICH von DANIKEN's latest book in English is now available in hardcover in bookstores in the United Kingdom, USA and Canada. Entitled Arrival of the Gods, the book is entirely about the strange markings on the Plain of Nazca in Peru, South America. The author examines the many existing theories surrounding the enigmatic markings and, supported by over 150 photographs of Nazca, von Daniken presents a new and totally surprising possible solution to the mystery of Nazca. The book is published by Element Books, Ltd., Dorset, England.

Cascading Comets, The Key to Ancient Mysteries, by Donald L. Cyr, is available in oversize paperback from Stonehenge Viewpoint, 2261 Las Positas Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93105. Tel: 805-687-9350.

ANCIENT SKIES is published bi-monthly by the ANCIENT ASTRONAUT SOCIETY, 1921 St. Johns Ave., Highland Park, Illinois 60035-3178 USA and distributed free to its members. Tel. (847) 295-8899. Fax. (847) 295-0868.

The Ancient Astronaut Society, founded in 1973, is a tax-exempt, not-for-profit corporation organized exclusively for scientific, literary and educational purposes.

WHAT WAS THE ARK OF NOAH MADE OF?

BY RENE A. BOULAY*

In my article on the unusual design of Noah's Ark in Ancient Skies 25:1, I suggested that the ship was probably ellipsoid, that is, circular with its diameter twice that of its thickness, sort of a disc shape configuration. According to figures given in the Sumerian account, it would thus be 400 feet in diameter with a thickness of 200 feet; in volume this is actually not very much larger than the measurements found in Genesis. Since it appears that it was probably designed and built by Shamash, the Sumerian Chief Astronaut/Engineer, it would in all probability have the appearance of a "saucer" or space craft.

A second problem with the Genesis account is the identification of the material from which the Ark was made. None of the commentaries on the Ark that I have consulted have even attempted to identify what "Gofer" (or Gopher) was. They all agree that it is not a Semitic word for any kind of known construction material, such as cedar, oak, pine, or any other type of lumber. The only academic discussion that I have found on the origin of the word is in the works of Alexander Heidel(1), the distinguished linguist of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. He suggests that "Gofer" is a borrow word from Hebrew's Sumerian heritage and changed to some extent in the transmission through the Semitic languages of Akkadian and Babylonian.

The Semitic word "GFR" is rendered as "Gofer or Gopher" in all the translations I have checked. However, this is merely a linguistic convenience since there were no vowels in ancient Hebrew and the word could be written with any combination of vowels, such as Gifar, Gufar, et al, for example. Gofer is a compound word of two syllables, which we must treat individually if we are to trace it back to Sumerian. The Sumerian language is agglutinative, that is, each syllable is a word-unit having its own meaning and the two word-units are combined together to form a new word. Heidel suggests it may originally be a loan word from Sumerian transmitted through Babylonian channels from the Semitic Giparu or (Kiparu). If that is the case, Heidel supposes that there must be an underlying word in Sumerian such as GUPAR or KUPAR. The Babylonian word Giparu appears only in one context in the ancient literature, as the official temple of the high priestess of the Moon-God Sin located in the sacred enclosure in Babylon. In her outstanding work on Babylon, Joan Oates, the Director of Oriental Studies at Cambridge in England, states that the only known activity at this temple was when the Babylonian King dedicated gold and silver objects here to the Moon-God.(2) Could the Giparu-temple be named after its unusual construction of some form of metallic material such as suggested below?

The word-unit GO appears to be derived from Sumerian as Heidel suggests. According to Sumerian language convention the letter "G" is interchangeable with the letter "K". Further, there is no "O" vowel in Sumerian, that is, no GO or KO syllable. Since vowels are inserted by the translator in ancient Hebrew, the syllable could just as well have been KA or KU (GA or GU), both being good Sumerian word-units. As suggested by Heidel the Sumerian root might be KUPAR, thus making KU as the best logical candidate for the first element of the compound word. Now KU in Sumerian is the root word for silvery or bright metal, as seen in the word KU-GI which means "bright metal of the ground", or gold. Thus the first word-unit of Gofer probably means bright or silvery metal.

The syllable FER presents a more difficult problem. There is no "F" sound in Sumerian so we must look to a permutation of the word. Heidel suggests PAR as in Giparu, a Babylonian word borrowed from

the Sumerian. It is a known linguistic convention that the letter "B" in Sumerian becomes the letter "P" in Semitic. Thus the Sumerian word ABZU, the primary residence of the Sumerian god Enki, becomes Apsu in its Semitic form. Thus PAR or BAR becomes our best candidate for the syllable of FER in Gofer. The primary meaning of BAR (or PAR) according to the Sumerian Dictionary published by the University of Pennsylvania is "outer covering or skin." (3)

If we are to accept the fact that the ancient ones travelled to this planet and flew effortlessly in and around our air and sea space in the past, it is just logical to assume that any craft built to withstand the rigors of ocean storms would also use the same technology. It is thus possible that the word Gofer is really a corruption of the Sumerian word KUPAR, which means an outer metallic skin or covering. We must conclude then that the outer covering of the Ark was made of a silvery metallic material.

References:

- (1) Heidel, Alexander. The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels. University of Chicago Press, 2nd Ed., 1949.
- (2) Oates, Joan. Babylon. Thames and Hudson, London, Rev. Ed., 1986.
- (3) The Sumerian Dictionary, Letter 'B', Edited by Ake W. Sjöberg. The University Museum, Philadelphia, 1984.

*Mr. Boulay, a retired cryptologist and historian, is the author of Flying Serpents and Dragons, The Story of Mankind's Reptilian Past. A revised and expanded edition of the book is available in over-size paperback from The Book Tree, 1-800-700-8733 and Arcturus Books, 561-398-0796.

DNA SCIENTIST PROVES HEYERDAHL WRONG

BY FREDRICK M. WOODLEY**

I have always been fascinated by Thor Heyerdahl's theory that South American people were the first settlers of the South Pacific region, including my native country of New Zealand. Our history teaches that the ancestors of the native people of New Zealand, the maoris, came from islands to the north.

In 1947, with his much-publicized Kon-Tiki Expedition, Mr. Heyerdahl proved that it was possible for humans to sail from Peru, on the west coast of South America, to Easter Island, some 1,000 miles to the west in the center of the Pacific Ocean. The explorer built a craft of balsa reeds, which are found in Peru, and successfully navigated the ocean by using the trade winds westerly to Easter Island. Heyerdahl then concluded that because it was possible for early humans to have accomplished this feat, they in fact did. Now, however, modern science has proved the Norwegian's theory to be wrong.

An article in the Wellington (NZ) newspaper, The Dominion for January 9, 1998, reports that a British dna scientist, Erika Hagelberg of Cambridge University, has revealed that after an eight-year study she performed of mitochondrial dna of Polynesians and Melanesians in the South Pacific region, there is no question but that the original settlers of the South Pacific came from Southeast Asia. The Melanesians settled in New Guinea and the Polynesians reached New Zealand, Hawaii and ultimately Easter Island. Ms. Hagelberg said that "though Mr. Heyerdahl's 'reconstruction' of the journey on a replica raft proved stirring reading, it was historically untrue." Mr. Heyerdahl is reported to have countered that the original settlers cremated their dead, thus ruling out the possibility of any evidence, but Mrs. Hagelberg said that she could look at dna from bones. "I examined a couple of hundred skeletons," she said. "It just takes patience and attention to detail."

**Mr. Woodley is a long-time member of the Ancient Astronaut Society. His address is 14, B, Breese Street, Lower Hutt, NEW ZEALAND.