The bones of Calico

Recently, the Pleistocene Coalition received copies of two official communications regarding the Calico Early Man Site in Barstow, California. We reproduce the communications below with only personal references deleted. They concern possible human bones discovered at Calico during the site’s early years.

The first is to the Friends of Calico and its Board of Directors. The second is a response from the Federal Bureau of Land Management, the governing body under which the site is operated in the United States. The Pleistocene Coalition was informed because this issue has been caught up in red tape for the past several years.

The topic of very early humans in the Americas from c. 30,000–300,000 years ago has been the subject of controversy for several decades. Unfortunately, the general public is not aware of the evidence for early entries of this kind since such data are routinely blocked from publication through the United States anthropological institutions such as museums and other institutions.

Scientists attempting to bring this evidence forward through traditional scientific venues continually meet the same roadblocks. They have no recourse when their empirical evidence is blocked from publication as long-experienced scientists attempting to bring this evidence forward through traditional scientific venues continually meet the same roadblocks.

The Repatriation Act is at the crux of the two letters reproduced. It is a difficult area as it relates to possible conflicts of rights between Native peoples and popular institutions such as museums in the United States. The coalition is not taking a stand on this issue at present but is simply reporting that an action has begun to have evidence of possible human bones from Calico brought into scientific discourse. The bones in question may not be human, but until a genuine scientific study is conducted American citizens will never know the full story.

Letter to Friends of Calico and Directors

From Ren Lallatin
Geologist; Native American Mohawk, Cherokee, Choctaw
Monday, December 27, 2010
Dear Pres. Vedborg and the Friends of Calico Early Man Site Board of Directors,

I am writing this to you as a Native American and a direct descendant of ancient peoples that inhabited this land. I am speaking in behalf of those ancient voices that were silenced so long ago.

What I officially request is that the FOC Board of Directors immediately undertake proper study and legal care of the bones recovered from the Calico Early Man Site excavations and curated for ~40 years at the San Bernardino County Museum.

As you know, Native Americans are very sensitive to the exhumation of our graves, even by those who are sup-
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"By May, 2008, nearly a year after the 2004-2007 research permit had expired, the bones had still not been addressed, even though it was supposedly a Calico EMS research priority."

Possedly "authorized", without court orders or legal warrants, to exhume our dead. That was the reason for the institution of the Native American Repatriation laws regarding proper treatment and eventual repatriation of burial remains, especially human bones.

I am, of course, referring to two separate sets of bones that have been housed and curated at the San Bernardino County Museum for the last 40 years or so.

1) The many bone fragments, curated, now catalogued and stored in baby food jars in the regular collection

2) The about 4 inch long by 1 inch wide, greenstick fractured bone with joint still embedded in the matrix, which is stored separately in the museum vault, and may be human.

I first learned, from a professional archeologist...that bones had been recovered at the Calico EMS just after I arrived at the site in 2005. I was shocked by the scientific and legal negligence of the facts that the bones had NEVER been studied for scientific data, like speciation and 14C dating, in the 40 years since they were recovered. I was also quite distressed to learn that if the big bone in the vault is human, it had never been addressed through legal channels under the Native American Repatriation Act.

[The] Former FOC Board President and Co-Project Director[s]...had made it a first priority to address the bones in their written 2004-2007 research permit with the Bureau of Land Management. Since 2004, the BLM has certainly had written knowledge through the research permit of the presence of bones in the EMS collection.

By May, 2008, nearly a year after the 2004-2007 research permit had expired, the bones had still not been addressed, even though it was supposedly a Calico EMS research priority...So here we are, January 2011, and the bones still are not addressed and the laws complied with. The Calico collection has now been fully catalogued. I have seen the computerized catalogue entries on the bones...There is even less excuse not to comply with the laws now.

I am requesting, through your authority as the FOC Board of Directors, that you all DIRECT the proper identification, study and dating of the bones through an independent, impartial research facility - NOT biased personnel of the San Bernardino County Museum - and return with written reports on all the bones by the May, 2011 FOC meetings.

I ask that the following tests, at a minimum, be done:

1) Identify the bones as to genus and species, if possible. Are there Miocene-aged reworked Barstow Formation fossil species?

2) Determine, for certain, whether or not DNA tests are possible on the bones, especially the large, greenstick fractured bone still partially imbedded in matrix

3) Date, using 14C, on especially the large, embedded, greenstick-fractioned bone

4) If the 14C age of the big bone or any other human bone exceeds the outer ~45,000 year reliability of 14C dating, resort to other dating methods to determine reliable dates for the bone.

5) If the big bone, or any other of the bones are human, instigate the proper legal dialogues with the BLM and the tribes in compliance with Native American repatriation laws.

The longer this is delayed for 40 years since the bones’ recovery, and especially with the big bone locked in the vault and hidden away, the more suspicious this looks. The more the bones are not addressed, the more negligent everybody is, including FOC, SBCM and the BLM.

I am asking you now to finally address the bones and care for them in the proper scientific and legal ways.

Deal with the bones once and for all, and let the scientific, legal and social facts, not opinions or excuses, speak for themselves. After 40 years of being hidden out of sight and dismissed as "irrelevant" and "inconvenient" or "too expensive", the true facts, hard data and legal realities of my ancestor’s bodies deserve to be heard, whatever the outcomes may be.

I will ask the FOC Board for a written copy of the full report on the bones at the public Friends of Calico general membership meeting, May 2011.

Sincerely,
Ren Lallatin, Mohawk, Cherokee, Choctaw
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"The longer this is delayed for 40 years since the bones’ recovery, and especially with the big bone locked in the vault and hidden away, the more suspicious this looks.”
- Ren Lallatin, geologist

RESPONSE FROM THE U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

BLM (Stephanie Damadio) message to De Schroth re Calico bones 11-01-19
----- Forwarded Message -----%
From: "sdamadio@blm.gov" <sdamadio@blm.gov>
To: "Schroth, Adella" <aschroth@sbcm.sbccounty.gov>
Cc: ...
Subject: Calico EMS bones study

Dear Dee,

Any requests for the study of museum collection materials that originated from BLM land that require the loan of materials and/or destructive testing requires BLM permission.

Loans

BLM museum collection may only be loaned with written approval from the appropriate authorized BLM official to facilities and institutions that comply with 36 CFR 79. BLM collections may not be loaned to individuals. Loans must be to a facility, institution or agency that will be responsible for the security and return of the collection as well as maintain the collections to professional standards. Anyone interested is a study that requires loan of the materials, needs to provide me, as the BLM authorized representative for museum collections issues in California, with:

- a written summary of the proposed research design
- time line for the proposed research
- the individual/individuals involved, their roles in the project and their qualifications/professional affiliations
- how the project will be funded if there are testing costs
- catalog numbers of object or sample
- security parameters for the materials

Destructive Analysis

Numerous scientific analysis and research methods are an appropriate use of museum collections, including methods that destroy or alter an object or specimen (i.e., Carbon14 dating, thin sectioning, metallography, neutron activation, DNA testing, etc.). Generally, the agency official shall not allow uses that would alter, damage, or destroy an object in a collection. However, destructive analysis may be allowed if such use is necessary for scientific studies or public interpretation and the potential gain outweighs the potential loss of the object. Destructive scientific uses should be limited to unprovenienced, non-unique, non-fragile objects, a sample of objects drawn from a larger collection of similar objects (36 CFR 79.10(d)5) or a small portion of a large object taken from the least visible portion. Destructive analysis of BLM California collections must be approved by myself as the BLM California authorized representative for museum collections issues. Requests for destructive testing should include the following information:

- artifacts or specimens to be sampled
- tests or analysis to be done
- use of the data
- amount of sample to be consumed
- catalog numbers of object or sample
- details of disposition of data and sample remains after analysis is complete

After the appropriate information has been reviewed, and any additional clarifications made, I will contact the Museum for information on the amount and condition of the materials to be researched. After consultation with the Field Archaeologist for the area where the collections originated, a decision on the request/requests will be made and communicated to the requestor.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (916) 978-4650.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Stephanie

Stephanie Damadio
Senior Program Analyst
U.S. Bureau of Land Management
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 978-4650
(916) 978-4660 fax
sdamadio@blm.gov

Ren Lallatin, MA, and author of the letter to the Friends of Calico is a geologist researching at Calico Early Man Site for the past four years. She is Native American Mohawk, Cherokee, and Choctaw.
Blocking data: At the editor’s desk
by Virginia Steen-McIntyre
Tephrochronologist (volcanic ash specialist)

"The reviewers felt that your article did not have enough documentation to support your conclusions and a longer format is needed to discuss your ideas and conclusions and to present your data. … This for a short geological note that discusses weathering phenomena!"

In two previous issues of Pleistocene Coalition News, diatomist Sam VanLandingham shared his experience of data block concerning the age of the Dorenberg skull and bifacial artifacts from the Valsequillo area of southern central Mexico (greater than 80ky as determined by diatom biostratigraphy.) An unethical reviewer and outright lies played their part there. Another source can be found at the editor’s desk. If the editor finds a submitted manuscript too controversial for comfort, it can be rejected outright, before it has a chance to reach reviewers. My recent experience with data block comes in here.

Hueyatlaco site, weathering characteristics

At the first El Hombre Temprano en América (Early Man in America) symposium in Mexico City (2002), I gave a talk on using weathering characteristics of volcanic ash and pumice layers to rough-date an archaeological site by use of the microscope alone (1). A companion piece could have pointed out certain features of the sediment in general exposed in the trench walls that might hint of age. I decided to write down these more general geologic observations as a short note to help archaeologists working in the area identify potential very early sites before a shovel of dirt was moved.

I submitted the first manuscript to The Mammoth Trumpet, a semi-formal venue for mainstream archaeologists in August, 2002, “Geologic Observations at Hueyatlaco, a Late Mid-Pleistocene Archaeological site, Valsequillo Area, Puebla, Mexico.” It was rejected November 5. One of the coeditors wrote, "Unfortunately, we will have to decline publication of the article. We both feel that it does not fit well within The Mammoth Trumpet.

I later submitted a manuscript covering similar material but with a different emphasis to the Geology Section of Current Research in the Pleistocene, a more formal publication (February, 2003, "Geological Observations at Hueyatlaco Archaeological Site, Valsequillo Area, Puebla, Mexico"). It was rejected June 30, 2003. The secretary for the Center Study of the First Americans wrote, "Thank you for submitting your article to Current Research in the Pleistocene, Volume 20. We appreciate your interest; however we cannot accept your article for publication. The reviewers felt that your article did not have enough documentation to support your conclusions and a longer format is needed to discuss your ideas and conclusions and to present your data." … This for a short geological note that discusses weathering phenomena! (The note was less than two pages long; the list of references cited more than two pages, single spaced).

At first, the CRP article sounds like reviewers made the decision. Perhaps. Except the same person was editor of both it and The Mammoth Trumpet at the time. You can read the rough drafts on my Pleistocene Coalition webpage and on my website (<http://www.valsequilloclassic.net/>, home page, "Unpublished Data" box at right).

Were the reasons given for the rejection of the articles the actual reasons they were turned down? I think not. It’s the association of that geologic data with those "impossibly old" artifacts in the Valsequillo region that is the problem!

Valsequillo sites, geology

Still not resolved (in late January) is another manuscript problem, this one apparently the result of simple miscommunication. It concerns the last manuscript of Harold E. Malde, staff geologist for the classic Valsequillo Project. (The Stratigraphic Debate at Hueyatlaco, Valsequillo, Mexico, H.E. Malde, V. Steen-McIntyre, C. Naess, S. VanLandingham.) Hal submitted it in early 2007 to the editors of a memorial volume honoring paleontologist Charles Repenning, our murdered colleague (see abstract). It apparently was accepted at the time, but we don’t have the details. Hal died of leukemia in November of that year, and his papers, in the process of being archived at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science, would be difficult to access at this time.
Blocking data—at the editor’s desk (cont’d)

“Were the reasons given for the rejection of the articles the actual reasons they were turned down? I think not. It’s the association of that geologic data with those "impossibly old" artifacts in the Valsequillo region that is the problem!”

“Evidence from vertebrate fossils, from early uranium-series dates, from later zircon fission-track ages and (U-Th)/He measurements, and from recent diatom studies imply that the principal archaeological site, Hueyatlaco, could be as much as 400,000 years old, Hueyatlaco rests unconformably on Xalnene tuff (basaltic ash) dated at 1.3 million years by whole-rock argon argon analysis. This finding differs greatly from a 40,000-year chronology reported by Silvia González of Liverpool John Moores University, UK, and we judge that alleged footprints described by her in the Xalnene are marks left by quarry operations.

As the second author, I took responsibility for seeing this paper through to completion and into print. Queries to the editors were met with vague replies: Yes, the volume was still in the works. Did our manuscript meet with their approval? Any revisions needed? No answer.

Alarmed by this silence, coauthor Sam VanLandingham began checking internet sources early this past summer. Sure enough. He found reference to an article that had been accepted for publication in the Repenning volume. A direct e-mail by him to the editors brought this stunning reply: “We received information regarding possible misappropriation of others’ work relative to the manuscript. It is our opinion that editors should not become involved in such a dispute, so we decided not to accept the manuscript.” The manuscript had apparently been rejected back in 2007, before Hal’s death, on the basis of unsubstantiated gossip, but we only discovered this fact three years later!

It turns out that the problem centered around the illustration of a Hueyatlaco trench profile that we had included to show the position of Sam VanLandingham’s diatom samples. We had been denied permission to use the provisional stratigraphic contact lines that originally appeared there, and the illustration for the manuscript still had them. I quickly sent the editors the profile sans lines (See thumbnail at the top of the VanLandingham webpage located at <http://pleistocenecoalition.com/vanlandingham/index.html> for a version that can be enlarged to show details), and again the way appeared open for the manuscript to be considered for publication in the Repenning volume. But it still had to be sent out for review, and now we were working under a tight deadline.

I was asked to recommend objective reviewers, and it took a bit of scrubbing to find some (most researchers have strong feelings about the Valsequillo sites, pro or con), but we were able to come up with three: a geologist, a geographer, and an archaeologist. Review copies of the manuscript were not forthcoming from the editors, and so I sent them copies myself. Unnecessary as it turns out: another miscommunication. Learned January 30 that only one of the reviewers I had suggested would be selected, and that the editors would choose a second one. Both now apparently have their review copies and are aware of the deadline.

Will the Malde manuscript eventually see print? In the Repenning volume? Elsewhere? Will it die on the vine? Time will tell. Meanwhile, I’ll keep you posted here in the Pleistocene Coalition News!

References:


Virginia Steen-McIntyre, Ph.D, is a tephrochronologist (volcanic ash specialist) involved in preserving and publishing the Palaeolitc evidence from Valsequillo since the late 1960s. Her story first came to public attention in Michael Cremo and Richard Thompson’s book, Forbidden Archeology (1993), and in the Bill Cote television special, Mysterious Origins of Man, hosted by Charleton Heston (1996).
Tetela 1 scribed bone: Oldest American artwork yet?

By Virginia Steen-McIntyre

"By that time the nearby Hueyatlaco site, excavated in the same indurated Valsequillo gravel unit, had been dated by uranium-series and fission-track methods to roughly 250ky."

In our last issue, the "mastodon and mammoth" one, we challenged the idea that the recently reported Vero Beach mammoth engraving was the only, or even the oldest evidence for the coexistence in the Americas of humans and these massive Ice Age beasts.

There we introduced Tetela 1 (Fig. 1), the scribed piece of fossil mastodon bone that may be older by far than the recently reported Vero Beach mammoth engraving. Tetela 1 is covered with animal engravings (Fig. 2 on following page), including the profile view of a double-tusked mastodon-like creature (probably Ryncotherium tlastacae) and above it a dynamic figure with spears (?) entering the body that some call a tapir and others a ferocious feline.

The artifact was collected by Professor Juan Armenta Camacho on the Tetela Peninsula, north shore of the Valsequillo Reservoir, State of Puebla, Mexico during the spring of 1959 (Fig. 3 on following page). Juan spied the large bone fragment weathering out of a low bank of indurated sediment (Valsequillo gravels) some 50 m north of what was later to become the Hueyatlaco archaeologic site.

Only back in the laboratory, when the fossil bone was being cleaned, was the artwork discovered.

Realizing its great importance, Armenta kept his discovery secret and spent many months examining the piece, consulting with various experts, and performing laboratory tests on fresh and fossil bone (Armenta Camacho, 1978, especially pp. 95-110. See my Pleistocene Coalition webpage for both the original monograph and the English translation. See also Hardaker, 2007 Chapter 1.3.

The public debut of Tetela 1 created a lot of excitement, both in Mexico and abroad. LIFE magazine and National Geographic as well as being displayed at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington D.C. B/w photo: David Hiser.

By that time the nearby Hueyatlaco site, excavated in the same indurated Valsequillo gravel unit, had been dated by uranium-series and fission-track methods to roughly 250ky (Szabo et al., 1969; Steen-McIntyre et al., 1981). These early dates were considered "impossible" by the site archaeologist, Dr. Cynthia Irwin-Williams, who ignored them in favor of a ca 22ky 14C date for a worked stone flake from the Cualapan barranca site a few km to the northeast, and a tentative correlation by me between a volcanic ash deposit.
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near Hueytlatoc and an ash flow dated at ca 30ky on the flanks of Iztaccihuati volcano to the west.

Tetela 1 disappeared while in storage at a government facility in Mexico City. It cannot at this point be sampled and dated directly by U-series or other means. Neither can any adhering matrix be examined for diatoms, those microscopic phytoplankton that Sam VanLandingham has used so successfully to rough-date the Hueytlatoc artifacts (2010 and cited references). If and when this can be done, a date in the order of 250-350ky is not impossible. After all, the Atepitzingo 1 engraved elephant bone with an elegant horse’s head “hidden” among the other lines (Armenta monograph Figs. 75 and 76; ranca as a possible bone pendant dated to that age range.

Fig.2. Drawings by Juan Armenta of several figures present in the Tetela 1 engraved mastodon bone. Armenta 1978.

Conclusion
Juan Armenta’s collection of artifacts contained several fossilized scribed bones (see his monograph). More should be awaiting, still buried, in the indurated badlands sediments surrounding the Valsequillo Reservoir. Perhaps it is time for scientists to take another look?

References
Armenta Camacho, J. 1978. Vestigios de labor humana en huesos de animales extintos de Valsequillo, Puebla, Mexico (Traces of human workmanship on bones of extinct animals from Valsequillo, Puebla, Mexico). Published privately with aid from the American Philosphical Society and the Mary Street Jenkins Foundation, Puebla, Mexico; 125 pp; 1,000 copies.


Art of the Americas from 30,000 B.C. p.86. LIFE magazine, August 15, 1960.


Virginia Steen-McIntyre, Ph.D, is a tephrachronologist (volcanic ash specialist) involved in preserving and publishing the Palaeolithic evidence from Valsequillo since the late 1960s.
LESSONS OF A RENEGADE RESEARCHER

On suppression in science

By Sam L. VanLandingham, Ph.D. Consulting Environmentalist/Geologist

"Orthodoxy or dogmatic belief systems can prevent new inspirations and can stifle the force of wonder in science which leads to the experience of new discoveries."

If success in the field of science is measured by holding permanent positions in institutions, corporations, government services, or universities, then those like me have been less than successful. However, according to forensic anthropologist Clyde Snow, the most successful scientists are those who become experts, not advocates.

When scientists become advocates for a particular theory or idea, they often become trapped by their own belief system, and their full scientific growth cannot occur. Science can be as dogmatic as religious orthodoxy, and the scientific community also can be overly protective of its own "holy relic," the status quo. Ironically, science is supposed to dispel dogma, but examples of persecution by the scientific "Inquisition" abound. Although the threat of actually being burned at the stake has passed, an iconoclastic scientist, like myself (or Galileo), now can suffer a kind of career "death." One would think that the scientific establishment, having been proven wrong so many times, would become a bit more humble, and admit they don't know as much as they think they do.

The following are recollections in my 50-plus year quest as a research scientist. They clearly demonstrate the widespread suppression by the scientific community of ideas which might be a threat to its own entrenchment.

Plate tectonics

In high school, I was impressed with the work of Alfred Wegener and his theory of continental drift (the precursor of modern plate tectonics). As early as 1620, Sir Francis Bacon was impressed with the match between the opposing shores of the Atlantic. In 1858 Snider illustrated how South America and Africa were united in late Carboniferous times, over 250 million years ago (see Fig. 1). By observing similarities of the Atlantic coast lines of Africa and South America in their geography textbooks, elementary school children could easily see how continents might have drifted apart. However, most geologists took a very dim view of continental drift until approximately 1960.

As a geology student at Texas Tech University (TTU) in 1957, I chose continental drift as the subject of my stratigraphy class term report. But my professor was displeased that I would be so enthusiastic about such a "questionable" theory, and my grade of C- was much lower than I probably deserved. The professor placed all the graded reports on a table outside his office, so that they could easily be retrieved by the students. By the time I arrived to get my report, it was gone, but its fancy and expensive binder remained. In the 1950’s, very few readily accessible copying machines existed, and theft, camera, or copying by hand often was used, if anyone wanted a copy of a document. Evidently, some fellow student did the most convenient thing and simply took my report. It was the only one known to be missing. Bizarre!

Within ten years of my term report, striking new evidence for continental drift was presented in the modern concept of plate tectonics. This caused an abrupt paradigm shift in geology. By the 1960’s, new evidence had convinced most of the original critics of continental drift that those few remaining
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Carl Sagan\(^2\) indicated that some of the earth’s commercially extracted natural gas may be primordial and not of biological origin. If some natural gas could be of primordial origin, couldn’t this also be true of oil? Thomas Gold, a respected astronomer and professor emeritus at Cornell University, maintained for many years that oil was renewable, primordial, and continually being produced under tremendous pressure in the depths of the Earth. As this oily primordial “syrup” migrated to the surface, it was attacked by bacteria, giving it the appearance of an organic substance dating back millions of years\(^3\).

Gold\(^4\) indicated that other planetary bodies (Jupiter, Uranus, Neptune, Saturn, and Titan), which were constructed of solids similar to those of Earth, also had petroleum on them. This peculiar statement is not so shocking in view of the hydrocarbon rain and atmospheres with hydrocarbon molecules associated with these bodies. Even more remarkable is Gold’s assertion that most of the chemists who have analyzed natural petroleum in detail considered a biological origin unlikely. Nobel Laureate Sir Robert Robinson\(^5\) claimed that, “... all of the arguments from the constituents of ancient oils fit equally well or better with the conception of a primordial hydrocarbon mixture to which bioproducts have been added.”

Doomsayers to the contrary, the world contains much more recoverable oil than was believed 20 years ago. Many petroleum engineers and geologists find it difficult to explain how the Middle East has more than doubled its oil reserves in the past 20 years, despite few new discoveries and a half century of intense pumping. Some geologists have suggested that the estimated 660 billion barrels of oil in the region could not be derived entirely from dead plants and other organic sources.\(^6\)

Pennz-Energy Company’s Eugene Island 330 oil field, deep in the Gulf of Mexico,

*Contd on page 10*
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might be compatible with Gold’s ideas. Upon its discovery in 1973, Eugene Island behaved like a “normal” oil field. After production peaked at about 15,000 barrels per day (bpd), it slowed to about 4,000 bpd in 1989. Suddenly Eugene Island began to rapidly refill, perhaps from some continuous source miles below the surface. In 1990 the United States Department of Energy granted $10 million to investigate the Eugene Island phenomenon with its anomalous geological formation and production history. The grant funds have been exhausted and many questions are left unanswered, but good indirect evidence indicates a link to a very deep-seated system of migrating oil, possibly a primordial and nonbiological source. In 1999 Eugene Island was producing about 13,000 bpd and reserves had increased from 60 million to 400 million barrels. Some would view Eugene Island as simply an anomaly of nature, but it is likely that this oil field has a deeper meaning in more ways than one.

Woes of a wayward writer

A few weeks after successfully completing work on my BS Degree in Geology at TTU in 1958, I took the university’s test for admission to graduate studies in geology. The results indicated that I had flunked the essay part of the test. Although admission had been granted to me on a provisional basis, it was judged that I would “not be able to do the research writing required for a thesis in science and should enroll in a remedial composition or technical writing class.” A strange situation, since I already had received fairly good grades in four courses in English composition at TTU. Moreover, my first scientific manuscript recently had been published in a respected journal, and several of my other manuscripts had been accepted for future publication. These were the first of well over 100 scientific articles and books, totaling over 7,000 pages, to be printed during my long career.

Upon leaving TTU without attending Graduate School, I already had more scientific work in print than some of my former professors. What was my writing “problem” at TTU? Could it be that I received better than deserved grades from incompetent English teachers and possessed some strange gift for writing which was not recognized by the examiners? More likely, the essay for admission to Graduate School contained some of my iconoclastic ideas with which the examiners (like my geology professors) did not agree.
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Data blocking by threat and intimidation

By Michael A. Cremo

My work focuses on archeological evidence for extreme human antiquity, evidence that contradicts the currently dominant theory of human origins. I documented this evidence in my book Forbidden Archeology (Cremo and Thompson 1993). After the book was published I made presentations about the evidence to academic audiences and the general public. In both cases, I have experienced attempts by scientists to block the presentations.

Let’s start with academic audiences. In 2007, I was on a lecture tour of universities in Russia. Professors had arranged for me to speak at Tyumen State University. Shortly before the lecture, the chancellor of the university cancelled the talk because of pressure from sources inside and outside the university who did not want me to speak. The director of a local branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences offered to let me speak there and asserted no one would influence him to cancel the lecture. Buses brought students and professors from the university to hear me speak. The professors told me that more people came than would have come if the lecture had been held at the university. I recount this experience and some others in my new book The Forbidden Archeologist (Cremo 2010).

Now let’s look at an attempt to block presentations to the general public. I fully documented the following case in my book Forbidden Archeology’s Impact (Cremo 1998, pp. 467-534). In 1996, I was a consultant for a television documentary called The Mysterious Origins of Man, which aired on NBC. The producer, Bill Cote, of B.C. Video, had read my book Forbidden Archeology. He wanted to include in his show some cases from the book. I recommended the dating of the Valsequillo site in Mexico by Virginia Steen-McIntyre and her colleagues, who arrived at a surprising age of over 250,000 years. I also suggested to Bill Cote some cases involving even more extreme human antiquity. One of them was the human artifacts reported by geologist J. D. Whitney from the California gold mining region. The artifacts were found in Tertiary formations (Whitney 1880). Some of the artifacts are in the Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley. I advised Bill Cote about this, and he approached museum officials for permission to film them.

The responses from the museum officials were interesting. “At first we were told they could not make the time,” wrote producer Bill Cote in a letter to me (August 26, 1996). “We countered saying we had plenty of time and could wait three or four months.” Museum officials
Data blocking by threat and intimidation (cont’d.)

responded with a letter claiming they had a shortage of staff and funds. The producers said they would pay all the costs involved in bringing the artifacts out of storage for filming, including overtime pay for the workers. The museum refused this offer. The producers continued to seek permission through various channels. "We patiently went all the way to the head of publicity for the University," explained Bill Cote in his letter, "but it seems the museum director has final say and she said no." Instead of new film of the California gold mine objects, the producers used the original nineteenth century photographs included by Whitney in his book.

The final program, in addition to segments based on Forbidden Archeology, also contained segments based on the works of others dealing with various topics. It provoked a storm of controversy among scientists. A report released by B.C. Video on March 4, 1996 reproduced messages from scientists calling the producers "morons or liars" and demands that "you should be banned from the airwaves."

"A report released by B.C. Video on March 4, 1996 reproduced messages from scientists calling the producers 'morons or liars' and demands that 'you should be banned from the airwaves.""

If scientists who support dominant theories about human origins were outraged when the program was first shown, this outrage increased when they saw the following headlines from an internet press release from NBC, dated May 29, 1996, announcing a second showing of the program: "Controversy Surrounds The Mysterious Origins of Man . . . University Profs Want Special Banned from the Airwaves. . . . Program That Dares To Challenge Accepted Beliefs About Pre-Historic Man Will Be Rebroadcast June 8 on NBC."

Some scientists proposed boycotts, as shown in this message posted to internet discussion groups for archeologists and anthropologists by C. Wood on May 31, 1996: "Anybody know who the sponsors are? I would like to get an early start boycotting them. There’s always the off chance that some of them will pull their sponsorship." Still others proposed pressuring the executives of General Electric, the company that owns NBC, to stop the re-showing of the program.

In the 1950s, the McCarthy-like campaign of intimidation might have occurred.
Data blocking by threat and intimidation (cont’d.)

"The worst of your crimes lies in the failure to offer the public a balanced view that compares the overwhelming evidence in favor of evolution theory and conventionally-derived dates for man . . . with the dubious and poorly documented ‘evidence’ the whackos cite."

"NBC should be required to make substantial prime-time apologies to their viewing audience for a sufficient period of time . . . In addition, NBC should perhaps be fined sufficiently so that a major fund for public science education can be established."

been sufficient to keep NBC from airing the program again. At least, NBC may have been forced to accept demands that the rebroadcast of MOM begin with a segment in which a "responsible scientist" dictated to the public how they should see the show. But NBC aired the show again, without such a segment.

Partisan scientists thought NBC should be severely punished for airing the show a second time. On June 17, 1996, Dr. Allison R. Palmer, president of the Institute for Cambrian Studies, wrote to the Federal Communications Commission, the government agency that grants licenses to television broadcasting companies: "This e-mail is a request for the FCC to investigate and, I hope, seriously censure the National Broadcasting Company for crassly commercial irresponsible journalism that seriously violates the trust the public should have in materials that are touted as credible by a major network. . . .

Last February they produced a program *Mysterious Origins of Man* that purported to be scientifically based, and received massive negative reactions from responsible scientists representing numerous areas of science. Following this response . . . they chose to use the reactions of the reputable and responsible science community to generate viewer interest by distributing PR announcements implying that the content of their show was science that the 'establishment' did not want brought before the public." It is, however, patently clear that the "establishment" did indeed not want the scientific content of the NBC show brought before the public, and Palmer's letter to the FCC is excellent proof of this. Palmer's protest was based on the identification of science with his ideas and prejudices.

Palmer continued: "At the very least NBC should be required to make substantial prime-time apologies to their viewing audience for a sufficient period of time so that the audience clearly gets the message that they were duped. In addition, NBC should perhaps be fined sufficiently so that a major fund for public science education can be established." Copies of Palmer's letter were sent to the executives of NBC and were widely distributed on the internet to Darwinist scientists, who were invited to send their own letters of support to the FCC. Palmer's attempt to get the FCC to punish NBC failed, but the very fact that such an attempt was made should tell us something.
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Member news: Matt Gatton, Dragos Gheorghiu, and John Feliks had papers presented this week (February 1-4) at the Aplimat 2011 applied mathematics conference in Bratislava, Slovakia. The three papers were:

- Probability and the origins of art: *Simulations of the Paleo-camera theory; The decoration of ceramic vases with Bézier curves templates in prehistoric Europe*; and, *The golden flute of Geis- senklösterle: Mathematical evidence for a continuity of human intelligence as opposed to evolutionary change through time*. Matt’s and John’s papers were presented by Mauro Fracaviglia, Professor of Mathematics at Torino Univ., Italy.
I abandoned my dream to be an artist in my teens. Instead, I studied art history at the University of Michigan. I struggled with dates, details and dynasties, but I loved the art and the stories told about it.

When I returned to art years later, I found myself in an inspirational vacuum. What to make? Where to start? On a whim, I dug out my old college textbook: Janson’s History of Art. I flipped through the pages filled with the art I’d studied and loved.

In 1970, history began with the birthplace of art: the Lascaux Cave. In my classes, I saw these images of horses, deer and aurochs as they may have been viewed 17,000 years ago: Larger than life. In the dark, lit by torches (a slide projector), on a cave (classroom) wall. They were hauntingly beautiful, and I became totally captivated, heart and soul.

My feelings were hard to reconcile with then-popular theories. ... the-killer-ape’s ancient heritage of aggression. Those beautiful images were just food animals.”

“The final clincher: Gouges in the rock face made by spears and arrows ‘proved’ the images were used for target practice. No mystery. It was all about survival. Case closed.”

I imagined these ‘invisible women’ made. Soon I felt the need for something more. What if I added artifacts like those women might have used and treasured?

Woefully ignorant of prehistoric artifacts beyond arrowheads and the Venus of Willendorf, I invented my own. I wanted bone tools—sewing awls, simple fasteners, and buttons. Perhaps these women, like me, liked pretty things, too. A highly successful hunter-gatherer myself (I love to shop!) I could easily imagine my prehistoric counterpart: “Here’s a grub, a good root, some berries... Hey, look! Sparkly pebble!” I needed rocks, beads and little horses.

> Contd on page 15
Stories from the cave (cont’d.)

I made them myself, with a new material, polymer clay, because it can be worked to imitate bone, stone and shell. I made the artifacts look old, worn smooth by the touch of human hands, lost and buried for 15,000 years, then rediscovered in our time. Intrigued by the mysterious cave markings—odd lines, smudged dots, handprints—I added those, too.

I told myself stories as I worked: With the stories came questions. Why do the horses always have noses, but no legs or tails? Why do they sometimes carry a handprint, but the fish never do? For an answer, I trusted my heart and followed my intuition. Years later, I found I had intuited better than I knew. The first time I saw the carved ivory Vogelherd horse, I was astonished. 30,000 years old and tiny, its delicate legs and tail were broken off—just as I’d imagined with my own little horses.

People constantly ask what the markings mean on my artifacts. I say, “What do you see?” Their responses vary. A musician sees musical notation. A historian sees ancient maps. A child, seeing white dots on a dark bear, exclaims, “It’s a constellation!”

And yet, one story isn’t “right” and another “wrong.” Not only do different people see different stories, so do different times. ... Stories told in 1970 about Lascaux were different than the ones told today. The evidence did not change; we did.”

“And yet, one story isn’t ‘right’ and another ‘wrong.’ Not only do different people see different stories, so do different times. ... Stories told in 1970 about Lascaux were different than the ones told today. The evidence did not change; we did.”

“I needed rocks, beads and little horses.
I made them myself, with a new material, polymer clay, because it can be worked to imitate bone, stone and shell.”

The ‘arrow’ markings at Lascaux? Perhaps blades of grass instead. The child’s guess of ‘constellation’ is spot on: the marks in a bull’s face may be a star map of the Pleiades—in the constellation Taurus! The ‘target-practice’ spear gouges in the cave walls? Made by another people who vandalized the images long after the original painters were gone. John Feliks’ correlation between markings and the fossil record adds another delightful and astonishing possibility. What stories were told to explain those strange figures bound within the stone? We can only imagine.

The invisible are now seen—the handprints of women and children on cave walls, their footprints preserved in the dried mud. Old potsherds carry the fingerprints of their makers—women. Surprising? Not really. Pots began as baskets woven to store food. When smeared with clay to waterproof them, then heated during cooking, they became low-fired pots. Who wove baskets? Who gathered, stored, and cooked food? Women. One of the oldest known specimens of fiber work—a piece of string—was found at Lascaux.

The story of the paintings has changed, too. They were made during a period of profound and rapid climate change as the great glaciers of the last Ice Age were melting. These people saw their entire way of life rapidly changing. Perhaps the paintings were their way of ‘calling the horses back.’

Maybe cave art is just about survival. But then, so is a cathedral. In the Lascaux Cave, I see an old story, and a familiar one—because we’re still telling it. Like a message in a bottle from our distant past but not addressed to us. We cannot read it, though we sense its power. Are the paintings a call for help resounding through the ages? We may never know.

Yet these images, handprints and artifacts, connect me profoundly to these people of our distant past. Just as we do, they made and loved beautiful things. Just as we do, they told stories to make sense of their world, to find and define their place in it.

We are the animals that tell stories. And the stories we tell reveal so much about us, the storytellers. When we believe ourselves to be killer apes, we see spears and aggression. When we believe ourselves to be something else, something more, we see stars, and music. We see hope.

I can only wish our own response to the challenges we face today results in something just as beautiful, just as powerful, just as compelling and just as enduring as Lascaux. As I make my art, I ask...

“10,000 years from now, who will know the markings of our hands?
And who will know the mysteries of our hearts?”

LUANN UDELL is a nationally-exhibited artist and writer with a B.A. in art history and an M.A. in education.

Website: http://www.luannudell.com/
THE DMANISI HOMINIDS

Part 2: Heights and Brains

By Alan Cannell
International Civil Engineer

This is the second in a series on the Homo erectus specimens (c. 1.8 million years old) discovered near the village of Dmanisi, Georgia, in the former Soviet Union.

The description of the Dmanisi hominins often attributes certain “primitive” features to them, in particular their relatively small cranial capacity and size.

Based on various independent long bone measurements, the fossils of three Dmanisi individuals indicate that they were about 143-166cm in height (1). Stature estimates for a large adult individual were obtained from humeral, femoral, and tibial dimensions, yielding a range of 146.6cm - 166.2cm (average 157cm or 5’ 2”). Stature estimates based on the length of the first metatarsal (D3442) gave a value of 143.0cm or 4’ 8” for the small individual.

Manuports were found at the Dmanisi site, but no details are given ...other than a general description of size, most with a diameter of 5 to 10cm. This is a pity, as it has been shown that a lot can be gleaned from the choice of manuports. The mass distribution of Koobi Fora and Olduvai manuports, for example, indicated that the relationship between height and brain capacity for men and women is thus: "y = ax + b". The relationship between brain capacity and stature varies from person to person, but on average, males have a brain capacity of 1.82 times their stature, whereas females have a brain capacity of 1.75 times their stature.

When this relationship between size and cranial capacity is applied to the estimated heights of the Dmanisi and Flores hominins, this results in values of estimated modern Homo sapiens cranial capacity (column CC Est. HSS). Thus a "modern" Homo sapiens sapiens woman of 145cm in height and normal proportions would be expected to have a cranial capacity of 1018cc. Scaling these values down to erectus levels, using the individuals D 2282/3444 as a baseline at the known value of 650cc, this model gives the erectus values in the final column (CC Est. HE).

A Dmanisi erectus male of 157cm would thus have a brain size of around 750cc, (but I don't think anyone would dare suggest that he was smarter than the 145cm females). If the individual D2280 were slightly taller, say 160cm, the model gives a perfect fit with the given value of 775cc.

> Contd on page 17

Table 1. Height and cranial size comparisons between modern test subjects and the Homo erectus specimens from Flores island, Indonesia, and Dmanisi, Georgia, of the former Soviet Union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Specimen</th>
<th>Cranial Capacity</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>H/Hfem</th>
<th>CC/CCFem</th>
<th>Relationship using</th>
<th>CC Est. HSS</th>
<th>CC Est. HE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted women</td>
<td>1260 cc</td>
<td>163 cm</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1260 cc</td>
<td>804 cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted men</td>
<td>1449 cc</td>
<td>176 cm</td>
<td>1.0798</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1449 cc</td>
<td>925 cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2282/3444</td>
<td>650 cc</td>
<td>145 cm</td>
<td>0.8896</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>1018 cc</td>
<td>650 cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2280</td>
<td>775 cc</td>
<td>157 cm</td>
<td>0.9632</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>1177 cc</td>
<td>751 cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Flores LB1</td>
<td>400 cc</td>
<td>106 cm</td>
<td>0.6503</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>576 cc</td>
<td>368 cc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Dmanisi hominids (cont’d.)

The model also works for the small female from Flores with an estimate of about 370cc – within 5% of the measured more modern value. A big strapping erectus youth, such as the Nariokotome Boy (KNM-WT 15000), would be expected to have a cranial capacity of around 900cc – which again fits the fossil data.

When dealing with cranial capacity of early man – *Homo* this and *Homo* that – we should therefore be careful not to ascribe too much to cranial capacity differences that may simply reflect size and sex. The small “primitive” crania of the Dmanisi hominins is thus probably a reflection of sexual dimorphism: three of the four may have been females. This includes the toothless skull of "Old Man," which was considered a male because of the relatively thick brow ridges. However, there is a medical condition in elderly women known as "hot skull" that results in the thickening of the frontal parts of the cranium. Perhaps this old and toothless individual also suffered from a similar process which thickened the brows? Certainly he or she was cared for by others over a period of several years, and may have cared for these same others when they were small – as Grandmothers still do. If the vowels are correctly translated from Georgian, “Bubya” might therefore be a better name than "Old Man."
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AN AVOCATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY PAGE?

by Virginia Steen-McIntyre

There's an old saying that a three-strand cord is not easily broken. Can the same apply to a newsletter?

One of the original goals of *Pleistocene Coalition News* was to bring together for mutual appreciation the works of artists and scientists, two groups that rarely mingle professionally. But we are overlooking another major group in our search for truth in the early man field, one that would form the third strand in the cord, thus giving our newsletter a strong base: the avocational archaeologist.

Traditionally there has been little love between the professional and the amateur archaeologist. "Pot Hunter" is just one of the epithets one hears in the halls of science, and it is often applied across the board. A pity. It is the avocational archaeologist who often makes the critical "first find" of an important new discovery, a point that may never reach the media. How NOT to clean the artifacts and art pieces they find! We professionals can do our part by suggesting how to document the position of an important find (photos, photos, photos!), how to photograph a piece (scale!), how NOT to clean the prize completely, and why.

As you can tell, we are only at the beginning stages of this idea. Interested? Contact me when I tried to place my edited version of Ron Alexander's "Driveway Archaeology" piece in the November-December issue. What to call it? Not a scientific article, not an art piece, but still an interesting idea that should be shared with our readers.

The addition of such a page could benefit us all. As the barrier comes down between the professional and the amateur real dialog and sharing can take place: new ideas about point-type distribution; new insights on fabricating techniques (many amateurs are also flint knappers and paleo-tool makers); new brains to pick! We professionals can do our part by suggesting how to document the position of an important find (photos, photos, photos!), how to photograph a piece (scale!), how NOT to clean the prize completely, and why.

"It is the avocational archaeologist who often makes the critical 'first find.'"
Pair of eyes or pareidolia?

By
Kenneth B. Johnston

Note from the editors:
Among other things, we at the Pleistocene Coalition are attempting to bridge gaps between the bureaucracy of academic anthropology and the more intuitively inclined interests of those who have reason to question the standard academic community, not the least reason being that historically those who question—and amateurs in particular—indeed often are the driving force behind change in nearly every science. However, we do receive a great many images sent to us which are purported to resemble animals in the real world, often called, “sculptures.” While we remain open to the possibilities of anomalous evidence, at this stage we cannot publish images of such objects unless they are found in situ (within the sediment) and not surface finds. In the future, this may change. Meanwhile, we will publish well written, interesting articles such as Ken Johnston’s one here, and provide a link to a website where his images can be viewed. Want to gain perspective on how one amateur collector sees the workings of academia? Read on.

As an amateur archaeologist my interest has been in crude and opportunistic coarse stone tools, especially hand-cobbles and finger-pebbles with little or no modification but with evidence of handling and/or use wear. This has led me to make very careful examination of the stone material I find in agriculture fields and construction areas near my home in Licking County, Ohio, and has lent me a unique perspective on the nature of artifacts in my locale. Most recently, my interest has been in possible intended iconography in suspected Paleolithic flint artifacts. Among archaeologists, there seems to be a limiting fear of being influenced by pareidolia, the psychological phenomenon of inferring meaning from random sensory data to the extent they will infer no meaning on objects or deny its possibility. Examples of visual pareidolia are seeing a dog in the clouds, a human face on the surface of Mars, the Virgin Mother on a grilled-cheese sandwich, or a feline head on a twelve pound block of flint with two eye sockets, two ears, nose, mouth, two drilled holes, standing upright in correct viewing orientation on its flat base. This item was found in context with other zoomorphic sculptures and which admittedly “looks just like a lion” according to a lithics analyst at a prominent U.S. lab. I mention the “lion head,” my real-life example, tongue-in-cheek, because of the conundrum that archaeology needs to (figuratively) come to understand the difference between the clouds, Mars, a sandwich and a possible artifact. Such interpretation is precisely the job, in fact the duty, of the archaeological investigator.

Many professional archaeologists have told me that they are frequently approached by people who bring them items that they are convinced are artifacts, when, according these archaeologists, they are objects of purely natural formation. This is often the way they gently dismiss me as one of the many misguided. I do not think all of these informal archaeologists are gravely naïve. Amateurs do not have the preconceived notions of what constitutes a stone “artifact” as formally educated and trained archaeologists. (I especially like artifacts in the “children-founds” section of the meetings I attend because they are the purest, least tainted by culturally mediated perceptual bias, pieces).

Each time a layperson raises these articles, questions are casually squelched rather than truly engaged. The possibility of new information for archaeology, to identify new artifact patterns and cultural sites, is killed. Is it not possible some of these people are on to something? Is it not possible that gut intuition, common sense and common reasoning can detect artifacts which are not already in a book or paper somewhere? Is the entire universe of North American stone artifact classification really completely known and now closed? For too many, it is so. It seems counter to any kind of real scientific or academic enterprise, but is plainly evident to many amateurs, who may have more time “in the field,” so to speak, than professional counterparts. Archaeologists must more carefully do the job they were trained to do and stop pulling the curtains closed so quickly on the public as if wizards of their own little Oz
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Pair of eyes or pareidolia? (cont’d)

"North American archaeology needs to reverse course and begin to breathe multiple tenets which will facilitate and expedite anomaly handling."

archaeology. The accepted taxonomy of the right-received wisdom of the establishment seems to be applied directly to artifact inputs, rather than accepting inputs, validating them and then letting valid inputs show us all the taxonomies (and non-taxonomies). "That does not exist because those have never been found" poses quite an intellectual dilemma when archaeology needs to be about resolving dilemmas.

In a rhetorical theory course in 1987 under William R. Brown at The Ohio State University, one of the reads was his paper, "Ideology as Communication Process," (Brown:123). Brown argues that "ideologizing" is the defining human activity, collaborating constructs of symbolic meaning to explain the world around us. For Brown, even science functions as an ideology, and this is no disparagement. He eloquently explains the scientific method in a way which makes it sound like a classic ideology. Ideologies, including all the sciences, must maintain healthy anomaly handling mechanisms, allow anomalous inputs, explain, correct for, or incorporate them, or else the ideology will fall. For Brown, "archaeology" would be an ideology, a way of shared understanding, like any other.

Problems arise when anomalies are not dealt with. Archaeology then becomes non-communicating for its key participants and constituents, a closed system in a vicious shrinking spiral. It, or at least part of it, will implode when anomalies reach a critical point where attention shifts to more cogent explanations offered by other ideologies. Examples include independent internet publishers, geology, engineering, genetics, linguistics and amateurs. This is happening now and regrettably the response from establishment archaeology is heightened denial, defensiveness and even suppression, such as (1) a museum curator of archaeology raising his voice and belittling me in public while performing outreach on archaeology day, (2) a New England professor wanting to receive online hand axe photograph submissions but none from North America because "Hand axes do not exist in North America," or (3) corrupt peer reviews as experienced by Pleistocene Coalition members. Brown would say with the level of the "fire brigade" response from archaeology to anomalies, it is functioning as a de facto cult, indicative collapse.

Before it melts away with all the drama of Oz's Wicked Witch of the West, North American archaeology needs to reverse course and begin to breathe multiple tenets which will facilitate and expedite anomaly handling, perhaps by starting with replacing its "rightness" with the concept of "progressively less wrong" as described by Paul Grobstein:

"People in our culture, by and large, tend to presume that someone, somewhere knows what is 'right,' and that each individual's task is either to be that particular someone or to work as hard as they can to learn from that someone what 'right' is ... the mindset long predates science as a social activity, but ... science certainly encourages it, and so it is appropriate that science should contribute to correcting it ... In an enormous variety of distinct fields of inquiry the same general pattern is becoming clear: there is no such thing as 'right,' the very concept needs to be replaced with 'progressively less wrong.' The difference is far from semantic. 'Right' is measured by proximity to some fixed idea, 'progressively less wrong' by how far people have gotten from where they started. It is the aspiration to be 'right' that leads to rigid hierarchical social organizations of all kinds, including educational systems. Wanting to be 'progressively less wrong' takes one (and societies) in quite different directions entirely: it encourages life-long inquiry by every individual, a respect for past wisdom and enthusiasm for contributing to future understanding, and an appreciation of the enormous value of interactions between unique individuals each of whom has unique perspectives to contribute" (Grobstein: 1993).

-Kenneth B. Johnston
kennethjohnston@hotmail.com
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Learn the real story of our Palaeolithic ancestors, a story about highly-intelligent and innovative people, a story quite unlike that promoted by mainstream science.

Explore and regain confidence in your own ability to think for yourself regarding human ancestry as a broader range of evidence becomes available to you.

Join a community not afraid to challenge the status quo. Question any paradigm promoted as "scientific" that is so delicate as to require withholding conflicting data in order to appear unchallenged.

Prehistory is about to change
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