The Pleistocene’s most well-traveled creature

By Tom Baldwin

I just was reading where they sequenced the genes of a 700,000-year-old horse. Seems they found it frozen in some permafrost in the Yukon Territory of Canada. Prehistoric horses really got around. They were found from Europe to North America. A lot of other large animals: saber toothed cats, bison, buffalo, camels, wolves, mammoth, mastodon, and the list goes on, managed to wander back and forth across the Bering Sea land bridge called Beringia. They called both Asia and North America home.

Yet while these megafauna were wandering between continents modern day dogmatists in the archaeological community tell us the most widely traveled of the Pleistocene’s creatures failed to make that crossing. Homo erectus (and/or a few of his contemporaries) managed to leave his bones scattered from Europe to Indonesia, from China to South Africa, from India to England, from Siberia to Spain.

As the continent of Australia has pushed north over the last millions of years it has managed to maintain a separate ecology. This is because a ‘subduction zone’ formed (a large trench) where the Australian plate buttressed against the Asian continent and started to slide under it. Even at the peak of the Ice Ages when sea levels dropped hundreds of feet, this trench was so deep and wide that it stayed full of water. It formed a channel approximately 20 miles wide that was an obstacle to life crossing from Asia to Australia.

The first person to note that fresh water fish as well as small land animals found on islands to either side of the barrier were different was an...
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Englishman named Alfred Russell Wallace. Since he was the first to notice this, the dividing line has come to be called the Wallace Line in his honor.

Only two large creatures managed to cross the Wallace Line and live on either side of it. The first was elephants (Fig. 1), and the second, Homo erectus. Both accomplished the feat about a half-million years ago. And we are not talking some unlucky individual washed out to sea on a tree during a flood.

Sufficient number of Homo erectus crossed to form viable groups or tribes. This took both daring and planning. Evidence is now surfacing that Homo erectus also found his way to Crete in the Mediterranean, an even greater trip by water.

It is a safe bet to say that Homo erectus—with his hunger for new land—was the most well traveled creature of the Pleistocene. Nothing else found its way into every corner of Asia, Africa, and Europe.

The animals mentioned in the first paragraph above, as well as many others, were going back and forth between Alaska and Siberia—the land bridge becoming a veritable megafauna super-highway—yet we are led to believe by archaeological authorities that early man stopped and did not make that same crossing, at least not until a relatively few thousand years ago when the Paleo-Indians did. In other words, the Wallace Line (twenty miles of open sea) couldn’t stop early man but Beringia did.

I find this difficult to understand and find myself asking a big ‘WHY?’ Then I realize it isn’t I who has to answer that question. It is the Archaeological Powers That Be. They are the naysayers. Therefore, they are the ones who have to show us why the Pleistocene’s most well traveled creature, didn’t do what animals by the thousands were doing.

In fact, there is ample evidence that Homo erectus did cross over. He left his tools at the Calico Early Man Site in California’s Mojave Desert (and at the Caltrans mastodon kill site also in California). He left them at Valsequillo in Mexico. He left them other places too. This is as should be expected. If he was here we should find evidence of that presence.

What should not be expected is to hear scientists screaming “geofact” when presented with artifacts and tools from Calico, stones that if found anywhere in Asia, Europe, or Africa would be quickly embraced as man made. Yet they are forced to do just that because they already believe that early man did not make the crossing and therefore could not have made the things that were found at Valsequillo—and are still being found in and around Calico. They must turn a blind eye on items that nature could form only in a world where monkeys on typewriters produce the works of Shakespeare.

It may be an apocryphal tale, but I’ve heard it told that one of Calico’s greatest critics, Vance Haynes, was confronted with one beautiful black graver, obviously man made and found about ten feet deep in one of the Master Pits at Calico. It was too finely made to be a geofact. He couldn’t admit the artifact was what it obviously was and that it was found where it was because that would turn American archaeology on its ear. Nor could he accuse a fellow archaeologist of Leakey’s stature of fraud.

What was he to do, he was trapped. So he came up with the claim that the artifact must have been accidentally kicked into the pit. Kicked into the pit! None are so blind as those who will not see.

Given Homo erectus’ well-known penchant for travel and the fact that Beringia was a major highway with all kinds of large animals crossing back and forth regularly it is logical to assume that Homo erectus did find his way to the Americas. Those who believe otherwise need to come up with reasons why not. Oh, and those reasons should be better than artifacts being kicked into pits.

Tom Baldwin is an award-winning author, educator, and amateur archaeologist living in Utah. He has also worked as a successful newspaper columnist. Baldwin has been actively involved with the Friends of Calico (maintaining the controversial Early Man Site in Barstow, California) since the early days when famed anthropologist Louis Leakey was the site’s excavation Director (Calico is the only site in the Western Hemisphere which was excavated by Leakey). Baldwin’s recent book, The Evening and the Morning, is an entertaining fictional story based on the true story of Calico. Apart from being one of the core editors of Pleistocene Coalition News, Baldwin has published five prior articles focusing on Calico and early man in the Americas.
Ice Age animals in Southwest U.S. rock art, part 3: A few miscellaneous comparisons

By Ray Urbaniak

Engineer, rock art photographer, researcher and preservationist

"In the same valley with the Saiga antelope petroglyph is what appears to the petroglyph of a mountain goat."

Continuing from Part 1, PCN#22, March-April 2013 (with the long-horned antelope images) and Part 2, PCN#23, May-June 2013 (with the camel or elephant-like creature, pronghorn, and Saiga antelope).

In the same valley with the Saiga antelope petroglyph is what appears to the petroglyph of a mountain goat (Fig. 1).

Also, on the same highly-patinated panel with prong-horn and the Saiga antelope shown in Part 2 is a glyph which may well depict a mammoth (Fig. 2). It is a very old panel where the patina of the pecked area matches the color of the surrounding patinated rock surface. In 2001, I photographed other very old petroglyphs in SW Utah which also appear to depict mammoths.

Fig. 1. Possible mountain goat depictions in U.S. rock art petroglyph. Left. Mountain goat drawing, 1876, public domain. Right. A Southwest U.S. petroglyph which appears to show a 'fifth limb' in each of the two side-by-side animal depictions. I suggest that these actually represent the beards of mountain goats. The general appearance of mountain goats is that both males and females have beards, short tails, and relatively short horns (as compared with Roan antelope, see below). This interpretation seems especially noticeable in the image on the right with the suggested beard directly beneath the horns—which is where it appears in the living animals. Petroglyph photo, Ray Urbaniak.

Fig. 2. Possible mammoth depiction in Southwest U.S. petroglyph panel. Left. Drawing of a mammoth. Middle: Possible mammoth depiction in Utah petroglyph. [Note from editors: See also Professor Juan Armenta’s Paleolithic mastodon en-graving on a mastodon bone from Valsequillo, Mexico: Tetela 1 scribed bone: Oldest American artwork yet?, Virginia Steen-McIntyre, PCN#9, Jan-Feb 2011: 6-7; “Never before in the Western Hemisphere”??? Tetela 1 mastodon, Virginia Steen-McIntyre, PCN#8, Nov-Dec 2010: 4-5; and Juan Armenta Camacho writes about his Valsequillo finds, PCN#15, Jan-Feb 2012: 6-7. Also see Ekkehart Malott’s Utah mammoths petroglyph in PCN#12, July-August 2011: 20; and Depiction of a mammoth in the prehistoric rock art of southeastern Utah, PCN#8, Nov-Dec 2010]. Right. The same petroglyph showing the glyph of a man which was superimposed over the mammoth image at a much later date; it is only visible when sunlight is directly on the petroglyph. Petroglyph photos, Ray Urbaniak.

Fig. 3. Two additional Central Asian and U.S. petroglyphs resembling the scimitar-horned oryx from Africa are compared with each other (See Part 1, PCN#22, March-April, 2013, for several others). Left. Roan Antelope (http://www.northrup.org/photos/roan/). Middle: Antelope petroglyph from the high Altai Mountains, Central Asia; crop of photo by Chagat Almashev (FSDA), used with permission. Right: Southwest U.S. antelope petroglyph, photo by Ray Urbaniak. The similarity in portrayal, style, and mood are remarkable despite the fact that these rock art depictions are separated by over 5,000 miles. Whatever meaning might be involved there is really no ambiguity as far as the horns go; they were clearly intended as long and sweeping.
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**Denver Museum Valsequillo early man archives**

For those of you who still have material you would like to donate to the Valsequillo early man archives at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science, I recently received the following information from Sam Schiller:

On 7/26/13, Samuel Schiller wrote:

"Hi Virginia,

We have been printing hard copies of the newsletter for the Archives. …I see we are behind on a few issues. I’ll go ahead and get those printed out.

Also, as Kris [Haglund] will be retiring, I will become the museum’s Archivist as of August 1st. Going forward, please feel free to contact me whenever new issues come out, and I will gladly add them to the collection.

Be well,

Sam Schiller

Collections Assistant

Bailey Library and Archives

samuel.schiller@dmns.org

Work 303.370.6089

2001 Colorado Blvd.

Denver, CO 80205

Fax 303.370.6492

www.dmns.org"

**The latest on the Younger Dryas Impact Caper**

...The paper is a beautiful piece of meticulous work.”

**Mauro Francaviglia was born in Torino on 22 June 1953 and passed away in Cosenza on 24 June 2013.**

**Some important guidelines from Dr. Jim Harrod’s policy regarding “figure stones” at originsnet.org.**

---

"The latest on the Younger Dryas Impact Caper"

---

**Obituary: Mauro Francaviglia**

We are very sad to report the death of Professor Mauro Francaviglia, Professor of Mathematics at the University of Turin, Italy. Professor Francaviglia invited, presented, and published papers by Pleistocene Coalition members Matt Gatton and John Feliks at the Aplimat conferences in Bratislava, Slovakia, 2010 and 2011. Professor Francaviglia was also a friend and colleague of Professor Dragos Chegothi, National University of Arts, Bucharest, Romania, who worked with Francaviglia on many projects and has been featured in PCN. From the Internet: Mauro Francaviglia was born in Torino on 22 June 1953 and passed away in Cosenza on 24 June 2013. He obtained his degree in Mathematics at the University of Turin in 1975 and was a Full Professor at the University of Torino. He held the position since 1980 when he was 27 years old. His scientific interests covered a wide range of topics including the application of Differential Geometry in Mathematical Physics, Classical Mechanics, General Relativity and Field Theories, Calculus of Variations, Symmetries and Conservation Laws, Quantization and Thermodynamics. Over 300 lectures held at various Institutions in Italy and abroad. He directed several national and international research projects. Author of over 250 papers, three monographs, 11 encyclopedia long entries, Editor of 19 volumes of Proceedings and Director of two CIME Courses. He organized 20 national and international conferences, including several national conferences in General Relativity and the World Conference GR14 in Florence (1995). Member of the Scientific Council of CNR-GNFM (1980-1996). Co-founder (1984) and Managing Editor of Journal of Geometry and Physics. Life member of the GRG Society, founder (1990) and President (1990-1996 and 2001-2012) of the Italian Society for General Relativity and Gravitation (SIGRAV); he also served as a member of the Board of the International Society for General Relativity and Gravitation (GRG) for nine years (1986-1995). Associate Editor of the Journal of General Relativity and Gravitation since 1999 and Managing Editor of the International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics.

Note from Virginia Steen-McIntyre and Jim Harrod on “figure stones” policy

This is part of trying to raise standards of scientific rigor for amateur collectors. We can at times be overwhelmed with images, so we have adopted some important guidelines from Dr. Jim Harrod regarding “figure stones” at originsnet.org. Keep these points in mind when submitting pictures of finds:

**Rule #1** We don’t consider surface sites if no way to date them.

**Rule #2** We are looking for sites that have been independently judged by a geologist or archaeologist as potential archaeological sites.

**Rule #3** Don’t send more than 10 images, max size 250k.

**Rule #4** Don’t send only “faces,” which are easily cases of pareidolia (looking at clouds).

**Rule #5** A stone has to have demonstrable working traces on it, verified by geologist, archaeologist or some sort of methodology.

Further considerations: Artifacts need to have some in situ context or have some kind of adhering surface residue which can be dated. Document the removal process in some way. Do not clean the artifacts. Once solid stone objects are removed from the ground and cleaned of sediment any hope of dating them no longer exists. Figure stones can be very subjective; one person’s “bird” can be another person’s “human head.” Because of this, we limit ourselves at PCN to specimens collected from within a sediment layer, preferably dated by other means, with photos of their removal. Check back issues of the newsletter from a year or two ago for examples.
Forgotten heroes of archaeology: George McJunkin
“Black cowboy” brings Native Americans into the Pleistocene

By Virginia Steen-McIntyre, tephrochronologist (volcanic ash specialist)

The chance to be foreman at a new ranch in the Dry Cimarron Valley brought George back to the land he loved. He had acquired a variety of books and instruments along the way—guitar, violin, telescope—and a collection of rocks and minerals to sit next to the tattered Bible on a shelf in his bunkhouse room.

A killer flash flood swept through the area on August 27, 1908, scouring the local Dead Horse arroyo to a depth of over ten feet. While riding the side of the arroyo assessing the damage McJunkin spotted several large bones projecting from near the base of the arroyo wall. It looked like a bison bone, only much bigger. Digging out the other bones he brought them home and displayed them on his mantle. He often spoke of them to his friends and neighbors but no one seemed interested.

Years later George McJunkin mentioned the large bones to a Raton blacksmith, Carl Schwachheim, after noting a giant rack of elk antlers on display at his shop. He gave Carl exact directions on how to find Dead Horse arroyo and his bone pit, a 30 mile horse-back ride from Raton. Nothing more was done at that time.

McJunkin fell ill in 1921, apparently of a kidney disease. He died March 163.
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"Human occupation of the New World was pushed back to ... 10,000 years ago. ...7,000 years earlier than any one had ever thought possible."

1922. It wasn’t until several months later that a group of amateur archaeologists including Schwachheim motored from Raton to the site in a Model A Ford. They found George’s bone pit just where he said it would be. That was the beginning.

It took four years for the men on that trip to convince Jesse Figgins of the Colorado Museum of Natural History (now the Denver Museum of Nature and Science) to make an expedition to McJunkin’s site.

Three summer’s field work produced the proof that Figgins had long sought for—the presence of early man in the area: stone tools and ice-age bison bones were discovered lying next to each other in the same clay layer. Human occupation of the New World was pushed back to the end of the ice age 10,000 years ago. That was 7,000 years earlier than any one had ever thought possible.

McJunkin’s bison, an extinct species, has been officially named *Bison antiquus figins*. I would rather have seen it named *Bison antiquus mcjunkini*!

MARTINEAU BELIEVED THIS PETROGLYPHIC LANGUAGE WAS BASED ON AN EARLIER HAND-SIGN LANGUAGE.

More on interpretation of animal petroglyphs

By Ed Swanzey

The recent series by Ray Urbañiak, *Ice Age animals in Southwest U.S. rock art, Parts 1 & 2*, provides some interesting food for thought about the horned animal figures in American Indian rock art. However, there is another interesting interpretation that I would like to mention even though it certainly could not be applied as a blanket interpretation to all petroglyphs.

In a book called, *The Rocks Begin to Speak*, the author, the late LaVan Martineau, suggested that the animals in American rock art are not simply representations of animals. Martineau suggested that the animals represent a sort of written language in which the figures and portions of the figures are like adjectives in a readable, though non-oral, language. Martineau believed this petroglyphic language was based on an earlier hand-sign language.

The shape of the animals’ bodies and horns are proposed by Martineau to describe movement, attributes, or the direction of the subjects of “sentences.” Martineau’s conclusions were tried in other contexts and appeared to work. He concluded that the written language evolved—as did the sign language—so that unrelated tribes with mutually non-understandable languages could have a common ground to communicate. (A good friend, Carol Patterson, and I spent some time on this subject. Carol took her PhD in archaeology at James Cook University in Australia, where she studied Australian Aboriginal art. She is a well-known interpreter of American rock art with two books on the subject.)

As to the “art” part on the subject of rock art in general, this is a topic that has been discussed over and over in anthropology literature and I will not bore by repeating any of the diversions here. However, I will say that in my own documentation work with the *’Skilallam and Suquamish tribes in the State of Washington that the standard sense of “art for art’s sake,” as many people commonly think of it, was not a part of daily life in these two tribes. For the *’Skilallam and Suquamish nearly all of the art which they made (and still make) is a part of daily functional use to the members of that culture. But again, with about 600 U.S. registered tribes and nearly as many federally-unrecognized tribes, over-arching claims cannot be made for them all.

For anyone interested in American rock art in the sense discussed here Martineau’s book is a must read. It is rigorous reading but extremely valuable.

Ed Swanzey is an amateur linguist who speaks several languages and dialects. He has a deep interest in writing systems and is currently working with the Chinese Shang Dynasty characters. He has an added interest in pre-Columbian transoceanic travel. Swanzey is a retired freelance editorial photographer and writer, and has worked with three Northwest Coast American Indian tribes, recording cultural recovery efforts. He assisted the Suquamish tribe in Washington in dig sites, and worked with Gus Gustafson on the Mannis Mastodon dig. Two major anthropologists are Swanzey’s cousins, so interest seems to run in the family.
Calico redux: Artifacts or geofacts?
Original 2009 paper updated and serialized for PCN

By Christopher Hardaker archaeologist, Earth Measure Research


Abstract. On closer inspection, Calico does not appear to be a natural rock crushing geofactory. Nor is it the case that Calico is bereft of definite and repetitive artifact types. Most tool types are either unifacial (including notched specimens) or bifacial in nature, hundreds of them, and delicately notched perforators (reamers, gravers). There are dozens of artifact types and subtypes represented, and there are thousands of flakes and tool types without cortex and with multiple flake scars. After a review of the controversy, tabulated data are presented.

This article reports on my findings from an examination of over 70,000 fractured subsurface lithic specimens from SBCM 1500A—the Calico Early Man Site—located just east of Barstow, California (Fig. 1). The fractured materials are chert, chalcedony, agate, jasper, and other siliceous varieties from medium to high quality. The specimens were collected during excavations from Master Pit 1 (MP1), Master Pit 2 (MP2), with a small fraction from other associated excavations, including Master Pit 3, Trench 1, and several pieces collected from Control Pit 1. Ninety-five percent of the pieces were collected during the 1960s and 1970s in 3-in. levels inside 5-ft.-by-5-ft. units.

The classification system was established in the 1960s and 1970s with very few subsequent changes. Occasionally assisted by avocational archaeologist and longtime member of the Friends of Calico, Chris Vedborg, the examinations took place in the Anthropology Laboratory at the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM) where all specimens are stored. The classified contents of MP1 and MP2 are contained in roughly 60 standard museum boxes. About 30 other boxes of specimens from other associated excavations remain to be examined and classified.

Over the past three decades, examinations often consisted of sampling single boxes of specimens or one or more total excavation unit collections, with results often unpublished in the form of notes and comments logged into catalogue binders. In addition, a number of filled binders of comments by professionals date directly to the 1970 Calico international conference. Several significant publications, pro and con, will be discussed in part 3 of this series.

These results are preliminary. Each specimen received only a quick and cursory inspection. The primary mission of this first stage of analysis is to record specimen attributes on a spreadsheet for the purpose of developing an inventory of...
Calico redux: Artifacts or geofacts? (cont.)

“A rock does not conchoi-
dally frac-
ture all by itself.

Fig. 2. A sample of how the Calico artifacts were photographed and cata-
logued. This one is a blade identical to comparable artifacts found in Europe. Work of Christopher Hardaker.

.. Many of the speci-
mens ex-
hibit multi-
ple flake
scars indi-
cating that
multiple
fracture
events oc-
curred
around the
same time
on a given
piece.”

the collection that is easily
accessible. A more thorough
examination of the lithic
specimens will proceed once
the inventory is complete.

Each specimen is given a
serial number (Fig. 2) ex-
cept for collections of multi-
ple flake fragments and clus-
ters (e.g. concentrations of
multiple flake fragments, or
debitage) that routinely
turned up in the 3-in. levels.
In many instances, the ma-
terials had been presorted
by unit into specific artifact
types. Many of these earlier
designations held up, but
others were interpreted dif-
ferently when the need
arose.

One of the advantages of
running all specimens by a
single set of eyes is that it
promotes consistency and
continuity throughout the
collection’s classification,
and this applies to correct as
well as incorrect attribute
assignments. It will hopefully
provide a consistent, or at
least orderly, foundation for
other analysts studying the
collection in the future.

My approach to examining
the collection initially fo-
cused on the concept of frac-
ture densities and that all
specimens with hard
(conchoidal) fracture sig-
natures were “suspects,”
be they arti-
facts or geo-
facts. Laws of
fracture me-
chanics dic-
tate that
something
had to con-
choi
dally
fracture the
rocks.

Discerning
chemical
splitting or
thermal frac-
tures from
conchoidal
(hard) frac-
tures is fairly
easy given
my back-
ground
rooted in
flintknapping,
including thermal exper-
imentation with various sili-
ceous materials.

The collection is largely com-
piled of pieces with con-
choidal features, exceptions
being the crushed surfaces
of anvil- and hammerstone-
types. The vast bulk of the
collection (70 percent or
more) consists of debitage,
flakes, and tools with little or
no cortex.

A rock does not conchoi-
dally fracture all by itself. It needs
help. Further, many of the
specimens exhibit multiple
flake scars indicating that
multiple fracture events oc-
curred around the same time
on a given piece.

Very few subsurface speci-
mens exhibit multiple gen-
erations of flake scars; also,
very few were weathered or
patinated, suggesting mini-
mal surface residency times.
In general, edges were in
fairly good shape, and some
were still sharp.

An abiding issue is whether
the fracture densities are
homogenous throughout the
total subsurface of the fan-
glomerate complex. As geo-
facts, it is reasonable to ex-
pect that if natural agencies
capable of fracturing sili-
ceous rocks are represented
in the Master Pit (MP) zone,
then the same agencies
should have been operative
in the fanglomerate deposits
beyond these excavations.
In other words, the same
fracture densities at the MPs
should exist throughout the
fanglomerate in general.
Whatever natural agencies
were involved in breaking
the rocks at the MPs, it is
reasonable to expect that
they would also be in play in
other areas of the deposit.

Preliminary assessments
suggest, however, that the
fracture densities in the Mas-
ter Pit zone are perhaps
hundreds of times greater
than in the sediments exca-
vated in the test and control
units located within the fan-
glomerate beyond this zone.
No natural agency—other
than perhaps some kind of
small diameter explosion—
can account for or explain
this super-local increase in
fracture densities.

Another feature related to
site deposition is that the
fanglomerates of the Yermo
Formation in the MPs are
virtually parallel with a slope
of about one degree.
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"No natural agency—other than perhaps some kind of small diameter explosion—can account for or explain this super-local increase in fracture densities."

The alluvial fan complex of the Calico Hills is made up of sediments laid down in possibly a dozen depositional events (Baty and Seff 1994; Shlemon and Budinger 1990). The alluvial fan was cut off from its source possibly tens of thousands of years ago and began to erode over the millennia. In turn, it has become the source of smaller alluvial fans jutting out from its perimeter. The specimens were captured within the alluvial matrix during the period that the Yermo Formation was building. To date there is no evidence that the specimens were redeposited within secondary depositional insets.

Uranium Series dates of 200,000 years were obtained from the base of the formation in the early 1980s (Bischoff et al. 1981). Thermoluminescence dates suggest a minimum antiquity of 135,000 years (Debenham 1999).

From the Calico Early Man Site (EMS) website, Fred Budinger (2005) provides a summary of what is currently known of the Yermo Formation:

**Calico Site Stratigraphy**

The artifact-yielding Yermo Formation overlies the Barstow Formation, and consists of two depositional units: a basal mudflow and overlying, crudely intercalated debris flows and fanglomerates; and overlying, reworked fan deposits, primarily arkosic sand, with a strongly developed relict paleosol at the surface (Shlemon and Budinger 1990).

The mudflow and fanglomerate consist of lenticular, poorly stratified layers of sands and angular gravel. There are no buried paleosols or significant unconformities. Deposition probably occurred within one climatic cycle of perhaps a few tens of thousands of years.

The upper, reworked arkosic sand unit (about 1.5-m thick at Master Pit I) contains highly weathered tuff fragments. Based on its lithology, distinctive red color, and other weathering characteristics, the sand was probably derived from nearby, previously weathered fan deposits. The overall stratigraphic section provides evidence that deposition occurred in response to gradual changes from semiarid to arid climatic conditions.

There is no evidence for depositional insets or cut-and-fill episodes observed in the Master Pits (e.g., Fig. 3) that could theoretically account for the redeposition of the specimens. The sedimentary matrix is well lithified and unattractive to reworking by local rodentia as well as to human trowelbearers who must learn the way of the hammer and chisel.

A main question is, where did the fractured specimens come from? Were they redeposited from elevationally and/or stratigraphically higher exposures of the fan complex, which presumably were nearer the source outcrops? Or were the specimens fractured in situ prior to final deposition and burial? Are both true to a degree? If so, how can we tell the difference? These issues will be dealt with in response to a series of papers supporting the geofact hypotheses, followed by a couple papers supporting the artifact hypothesis in upcoming PCN issues.

**References cited**


**Chris Hardaker** is an archaeologist working in California and is one of the founding members of the Pleistocene Coalition. He reviewed and catalogued the data from the massive artifact collection of Calico. Hardaker is also author of the book, The First American: The suppressed story of the people who discovered the New World.

For more information on the story of Calico and Chris Hardaker’s cataloguing of all the artifacts visit:

http://calico.earthmeasure.com/

and

http://calicochopper.earthmeasure.com/
Debunking evolutionary propaganda, Part 3: Fictions taught as fact in college textbooks, 2nd half

A lifelong reader of textbooks in every field exposes "thousands" of examples of false statements of fact and other propaganda techniques easily spotted in anthropology, biology, and paleontology textbooks

By John Feliks

"A clear line of fossils now traces the transition between whales and hoofed mammals... reptiles and mammals... dinosaurs and birds... apes and humans."


"A clear line of fossils? Fraudulent statements like this, ubiquitous in evolution-based college textbooks (e.g., Figs. 1-7), will be the downfall of science if the community does not distance itself from the blatant use of fraud to manipulate people's beliefs. Anthropology, biology, and paleontology have become a conglomerate easily provable to employ fraud in the captive audience science classroom. Except that they're being paid, I would not want to be the AAAS or an attorney representing mainstream science at this point.

When I was a boy in 1960s Michigan there were several things I wanted to be when I grew up. They included, paleontologist (see Tales of a Fossil Collector in this issue); marine biologist; astronaut; artist/musician; and detective or attorney.

As far as the desire to be an attorney goes, it was inspired by the television program, Perry Mason—excellent television giving a sense of critical thinking until the show ended in 1966. But right on the heels of Perry Mason (and no less, the thought-provoking series, The Outer Limits), just a few months later began the baby-boomer life-changing phenomenon of Star Trek.

One typically hears how Star Trek influenced modern technology. That's obvious. However, I would like to say that one of Star Trek's biggest influences on me as a 12-year-old was Science Officer Spock's constant referral to logical thinking. Of course, I also admired Captain Kirk et al.

This whole notion of logical or critical thinking led me to the school library and a book on logic. That is when (unrelated to any classes) I first learned about logical fallacies, overgeneralization, circular reasoning, black & white thinking, etc., all of which are generally considered bad science. It was many years later I discovered that these are traits of evolutionary fanaticism. The logic book also brought me to Plato and eventually reading many of his dialogues, learning perspective, Theory of Forms, and a general sense of putting actual effort into thinking.

So, that is where my idealized expectations of science came from. However, as most readers already know, after experiencing censorship of empirical evidence starting with a paper called The Impact of Fossils on the Development of Visual Representation (again, see Tales of a Fossil Collector), and later, The Graphics of Bilzingsleben, awareness of publication control by evolution fanatics began to emerge; and trust in peer review as 'science' appropriately dissolved to nothing. Regarding the censorship of Fossils, anthropologist Paul Bahn wrote me that Current Anthropology published "a lot of rubbish" while blocking good papers.

Anthropologist Randy White expressed identical sentiment regarding the censorship as did many other leading authorities. Censorship makes deception possible by removing the means to assess evidence objectively. False statements then become unrecognizable even to textbook writers; and very few will even bother investigating evidence for themselves. This is how textbooks enable fanatics to control the public mind. They are going to need dozens of attorneys defending them once the scope of this deception cracks open.

Continuing from Part 2...

18.) Most fossil intermediates in vertebrate evolution have indeed been found."


This is an outright fraudulent statement that is not even close to being true as the following quotes will attest. The same is the case for invertebrates with literally zillions upon zillions upon zillions of fossils (you have to...
Fictions taught as fact in college textbooks (cont.)

"Censorship makes deception possible by removing the means to assess evidence objectively."

"Paleontologists ... make educated guesses about which fossil species represent ancestors that live at the branch points of the cladogram..."


"Biography, 6th Ed. Raven et al, 2002: 441

20.) "A clear line of fossils now traces the transition between whales and hoofed mammals... reptiles and mammals... dinosaurs and birds... apes and humans."


Despite the boldness with which the Biology textbook makes the above statement it regularly contradicts itself as do all such textbooks. To assess the value of the statement consider the following concessions from another textbook. It should be obvious that there is general knowledge in biology, palaeontology, and anthropology that they are making false claims. Admission that what they are saying is not true is at the heart of textbook deception:

21.) "Although some may find it frustrating, human evolution is just like that of other groups in that we have followed an uncertain evolutionary path."


Frustrating is clearly not the right word. Historical Geology presents evolution as a fact; yet in moments of lucidity, like this one, they come right out and admit that there is nothing clear about the claims at all. They emphasize this point a few pages further in:

22.) "There is no clear consensus on the evolutionary history of the hominid lineage."

Historical Geology, 5th Ed, Wicander et al., 2007: 402.

23.) "Humans arose from australopithecine ancestors. Many experts believe that the recently discovered Australopithecus garhi or a similar species gave rise to the genus Homo."


Evolutionary double-speak. Here the fiction is first presented as fact followed by a direct admission it is "belief." Students find no discrepancy between a statement of fact and the same statement reiterated as a belief.

24.) "One can draw the hominin family tree in two very different ways, either lumping variants together or splitting them into separate species."


25.) "The fossil database for hominids is frustratingly sparse."

A few pages earlier the authors state as fact that there is a "clear line of fossils" between apes and humans (p. 455). If there is a clear line of fossils then why all the interpretation? Here the authors admit that they don't even know if various hominid fossils are different species. This isn't exactly unimportant when it comes to the idea of evolution. The quandary applies to all fossils.

26.) "Paleontologists... make educated guesses about which fossil species represent ancestors that live at the branch points of the cladogram..."

-Pleistocene Coalition News
Fictions taught as fact in college textbooks (cont.)

27.) “Early in its evolutionary history, the primate lineage split into two main branches. ...Too few fossil primates have been discovered to reveal with certainty their evolutionary relationships.”


As above, this is typical evolutionary doublespeak; the first sentence is stated as fact while the following sentence (in the referred figure) shows it was a false statement.  

28.) “Any single evolutionary scheme of hominid evolution presented here would be premature.”

- Historical Geology, 5th Ed, Wicander et al., 2007: 404.

So the authors say, and in this form, it almost sounds scientific. However, a few pages further the textbook proceeds to tell students exactly how humans evolved as if it had never said otherwise:

29.) “The oldest known hominid is Sahelanthropus. ...It was followed by Oreorin...then...Ardipithecus.... Recent discoveries indicate Ardipithecus evolved into Australopithecus. ...The human lineage began...with the evolution of Homo habilis. ...Homo erectus evolved from Homo habilis. ...Homo sapiens evolved from H. erectus.”

- Historical Geology, 5th Ed, Wicander et al., 2007: 410.

The human evolution mythology presented as a fact. The authors even misuse a trusted scientific word, “indicate.” “Indicate” expresses a certainty. There is no more certainty that Ardipithecus evolved into Australopithecus than that bonobos evolved into Australopithecus:

30.) “The footprints [the 3.6 million-year old Laetoli, Tanzania, human footprints] confirm skeletal evidence that the species [Australopithecus afarensis] had a fully erect posture.”


31.) “These fossil footprints...are not human. ...They record...Australopithecus, the group from which our genus, Homo, evolved. ...Human evolution is the part of the evolution story...which we know the most.”


This ongoing myth of australopithecine posture being confirmed by the Laetoli footprints is false. There is no association between the two. The myth was started by Donald Johanson (discoverer of Lucy) who commandeered the footprints from their discoverer, Mary Leakey. Leakey was about to introduce them as the oldest “human” footprints (D. Ellis, The Leakey Family: Leaders in the Search for Human Origins, 1978: 100). Leakey should not have accepted Johanson’s takeover of the Laetoli footprints. Instead, she simply responded with her deep regret that “the Laetoli fossil is now doomed to be called Australopithecus afarensis.”

32.) “Make no mistake about it. They are like modern human footprints.”

- Tim White, excavator of the Laetoli footprints; Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind, by Donald Johanson

33.) “Because of the recent controversy concerning the teaching of evolution in the public schools...how would you go about convincing the school board that humans have indeed evolved from earlier hominids?”

- Historical Geology, 5th Ed, Wicander et al., 2007: 404.

This is clearly not a normal science question. Modern academia tries to convince students of evolution any way it can. In this particular instance the captive audience science classroom is used to ask a “leading question” of students on an obviously debatable subject. It shows the type of thinking skills students are given as they go through academic training and are sent out into the world. It is not a question for critical thinking. It is one for simple memorization as noted in the Prologue quotes of Part 1. It also shows part of how higher institutional education produces graduates without scientific objectivity but with an agenda attached (See Part 2).

If human evolution is the part of the evolution story the authors of Biology claim we “know the most” then the few quotes provided in this installment should show that the whole paradigm is in trouble. It is no wonder that students who graduate with degrees in the evolution conglomorate come out reliant on techniques of propaganda (Part 1) as a defense for their training. As shown, neither students nor textbook writers are able to distinguish facts from fiction when it comes to evolution. Students are trained not to look into the evidence—or lack—for themselves. For them, the only option is to believe that somewhere out there paleontologists have all this overwhelming fossil evidence they keep hearing about. So, in the final turn, what we are actually talking about is faith. Faith is a part of all science and is fine except when promoting a myth of origins as fact while withholding relevant evidence that does not support the myth. That circumstance is not science.

John Feliks has specialized in the study of early human cognition for nearly twenty years demonstrating beyond any reasonable doubt that human cognition does not evolve. His work and empirical geometric evidence have been censored by the evolution community. Earlier, his focus was on the fossil record studying fossils in the field across the U.S. and parts of Canada as well as studying many of the classic texts (Treatise on North American Fossils, Index Fossils of North America, etc.). He wrote the article, Ardi: How to Create a Science Myth, and claims that all pre-human hominids or similar claims for transitional invertebrate fossils are equally as easy to debunk because when the paradigm is flawed it is not difficult to debunk everything it contains. Feliks encourages students going through standard science training to openly question the ideology being forced upon them as fact in the captive audience science classroom with full confidence that evidence is there to support them.
Neanderthal-Denisovan-Aboriginal DNA connection

By Vesna Tenodi MA, archaeology; artist and writer

With their research results between 2010 and 2013, the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, in Leipzig, Germany, upended the firmly established theories of Homo sapiens origins. Out-of-Africa, with both the Replacement model as well as the Assimilation model were out the window.

The one-point-of-origin paradigm was overnight, so to speak, replaced with multiregional evolution and coexistence of different races—from the archaic ones to modern humans—occupying the same regions. Furthermore, mtDNA and genome sequencing showed that interbreeding of the ancestors of humanity produced the genetic diversity and migratory routes, a notion which was in the past entertained only by visionaries in archaeological circles.

Humans and Neanderthals interbred. Dr. Svante Pääbo and his team at the Max Planck Institute determined that a full 1% to 4% of the genome of Asian and European people of non-African descent is Neanderthal.

Replacement and Assimilation models are out—the Hybridization model is in

Pääbo’s team upset the primacy of the Replacement model even further with the study results announced in March 2013, showing that Aboriginal Australians, as well as other Oceanic groups, share 1% to 6% of their genome with Denisovans, while people of Eurasian and African descent do not.

These results were confirmed through parallel studies conducted at the Harvard Medical School in Boston, the University of Copenhagen in Denmark, and the University of Tartu in Estonia. Also, the research had shown that Aboriginal samples can trace as much as 11% of their genomes to migratory groups which reached Australia from India around 4,000 years ago (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, January 2013).

How it all started

In the early 1920s, British ethnologist Alfred Cort Had- don acquired a tuft of human hair from a young Aboriginal man. He added it to his sizeable collection of hair from people living around the world. Ninety years later, those locks have yielded the first complete genome sequence of an Aboriginal Australian, and provided clues about the timing of human migrations (Nature 477, September 2011).

Over the last three years, Australian scientists have tried to obstruct the research, claiming it does not comply with "ethical standards," "social responsibility" and "cultural sensitivity." They also quoted other similar imperatives as expressed in the Newspeak jargon, established by the Australian Archaeological Association in the early 1980s. There were demands for international scientists to obtain "permission" from present-day Aboriginal tribes, and to give them full control over research, duplicating practice enforced in Australia.

European scientists were stunned at those demands. They saw nothing unethical in conducting a research study which complies with the main, guiding ethical principle of science—to learn the truth.

While some international scientists tried to please the Australian objectors, others were suspicious of the motives behind those demands. Some refused to get drawn into something they were fully aware might cause them years, or even decades, of obstruction and

> Cont. on page 14
Neanderthal-Denisovan-Aboriginal DNA (cont.)

"Over the last few decades, they have been successful in destroying politically inconvenient archaeological finds, and managed to prevent wide dissemination of politically undesirable test results."

delays, and ultimately compromise their results by giving an outside group the right to decide which findings should be released and which should be suppressed.

A Danish bioethical review board did not believe it was necessary to review their project because it viewed the hair as an archaeological specimen and not as a biological one. It was an elegant way of cutting the Gordian knot of irrational demands.

The Max Planck team also upended the misconception but politically enforced theory about the origins of Australian Aboriginals. Their research showed that the genome of the Australian Aborigines contains contribution from Denisovans and Indians, and none from Africans.

A separate study which showed an Aboriginal-Indian connection was led by Mark Stoneking, a geneticist at the Max Planck Institute. Its results contradict a commonly held view that Australia had no contact with the rest of the world between the arrival of the first humans around 45,000 years ago and the coming of Europeans in the eighteenth century.

Researchers in Stoneking’s laboratory discovered signs of the Indian migration by comparing genetic variation across the entire genomes of 344 individuals, including aboriginal Australians from the Northern Territory, islanders from Papua New Guinea, several populations from Southeast Asia and India and a handful of people from the United States and China.

The researchers also found evidence of more recent genetic mixing, or gene flow, between the Indian and northern Australian Aboriginal populations—taking place around 141 generations ago. This gene flow could not therefore have occurred during the initial wave of migration into Australia. A few smaller studies of mitochondrial DNA and the Y chromosome have also hinted at recent gene flow between India and Australia.

The genetic mingling coincided with the arrival in Australia of microliths—small stone tools that formed the tips of weapons—and the first appearance in the fossil record of the dingo, which most closely resembles Indian dogs. All of these changes may be related to the same migration from India about 4,000 years ago (Nature, January 2013).

Mounting evidence

At the University of Florence, genetic analysis and studies of comparative morphology are also being conducted, on the Neanderthal mandible known as the Mezzena Jaw, discovered in Italy.

The skeletal remains of an individual living in northern Italy 40,000–30,000 BP are believed to be that of a human/Neanderthal hybrid. If further analysis of Italian fossil finds proves the theory correct, the remains belonged to the first known such hybrid, providing further direct evidence that humans and Neanderthals interbred. The study focuses on the individual’s jaw, which was unearthed at a rock-shelter called Riparo di Mezzena in the Monti Lessini region of Italy. Neanderthals and modern humans both inhabited Europe at the time (Plosone International Scientific Journal, March 2013; Discovery News, March 2013).

These increasingly complex DNA-sharing results suggest interbreeding of various archaic groups with anatomically modern humans, with different points of origin and migratory routes. It can be concluded that in our deep past, archaic humans lived alongside modern humans in a number of regions, and interbred to produce variants, or hybrids, of both species.

Following the money—unethical practices of hiding the truth

The current genetic research results and evolutionary studies are very upsetting for the Aboriginal community and the dogmatic archaeological circles in Australia. Over the last few decades, they have been successful in destroying politically inconvenient archaeological finds, and managed to prevent wide dissemination of politically undesirable test results. Their efforts to hide the truth include arbitrary re-dating of puzzling archaeological material. One such example is Mungo Man:

In 2001, the Australian geneticist Gregory Adcock and his team dated the gracile Mungo 3 fossil remains to 62,000+ years old, showing that modern man inhabited Australia much earlier than archaic man—such as the robust Kow Swamp skeletons, dated to about 15,000 BP. The results were promptly “revised” by a group of archaeologists who declared that these results were incorrect, and decided that the Mungo Man remains...
Neanderthal-Denisovan-Aboriginal DNA (cont.)

are no older than 40,000 BP, the figure set by “consensus.”

While we now see a flurry of activity within the international scientific community, energised by these exciting results, Australian scientists are keeping silent. They are unwilling to let go of the false tenets of evolutionary and Aboriginal origins, but are not quite sure how to stop the research in other countries. One thing is certain, however, they now have a problem on their hands, as international scientists do not have to comply with Australian protocols and procedures. Australian scientists are upset that there is research going on confirming a DNA connection between the Neanderthal, Denisovan, Indian and Aboriginal groups. Under the enforced “repatiation policy,” many universities and museums have returned bones from their collections to Aboriginal groups to be destroyed. But Australian scientists are also unhappy with the fact that some institutions, such as the British Museum in London, generally exclude hair and nails from the repatriation policy. This means that international scientists still can obtain valuable material for study of the genomes of people from around the world, including Australian Aborigines and populations that no longer exist.

On the positive side, there are voices being raised in Australia to stop these “ethical protocols” which breach the first ethical imperative of science—to seek the truth.

One of those voices is a well-known Australian geneticist Dr Sheila van Holst Pellekaan. Her genetic research has been obstructed since 1992, when her mtDNA analysis of several Aboriginal groups—haplogroups—indicated multiple migratory waves into Australia. Over the subsequent 20 years, new demands were added to the already impossible list of conditions. One of these conditions, introduced in 2011, is for a researcher to “establish another reference group, consisting of Aborigines with expertise in health and genetics” (Sheila van Holst Pellekaan, Investigative Genetics, October 2012). That unfeasible requirement clearly falls into the category of impossible conditions, designed to obstruct and prevent any honest study of Aboriginal races.

Even though written with sensitivity and great consideration, Dr van Holst makes it clear that she disagrees with the current processes which obstruct genetic research. Her paper also points out the main motivation behind this stifling of science in Australia: the fear that genetic research would endanger Aboriginal land claims and would pose a threat to Native Title law as it stands.

The true motives behind the current Aboriginal policy have only clearly emerged in the last couple of years. The current policy has little to do with “ethics and cultural sensitivities.” Rather, it is about money, land ownership, and the lust for political power.

“**In 2001, the Australian geneticist Gregory Adcock and his team dated the gracile Mungo 3 fossil remains to 62,000+ years old... The results were promptly ‘revised’ by a group of archaeologists... the figure set by ‘consensus.’”**

**VESNA TENODI** is an archaeologist, artist, and writer based in Sydney, Australia. She received her Master’s Degree in Archaeology from the University of Zagreb, Croatia. She also has a diploma in Fine Arts from the School of Applied Arts in Zagreb. Her Degree Thesis was focused on the spirituality of Neolithic man in Central Europe as evidenced in iconography and symbols in prehistoric cave art and pottery. After migrating to Sydney, she worked for 25 years for the Australian Government, and ran her own business. Today she is an independent researcher and spiritual archaeologist, concentrating on the origins and meaning of pre-Aboriginal Australian rock art. In the process, she is developing a theory of the Pre-Aboriginal races which she has called the Rajanes and Abrajanes. In 2009, Tenodi established the DreamRaiser project, with a group of artists who explore iconography and ideas contained in ancient art and mythology.

Website: [www.modrogorje.com](http://www.modrogorje.com)
Email: ves@theplanet.net.au
Tales of a fossil collector
Part 1
By John Feliks

In earlier issues of PCN, I mentioned my background in the arts and also that I came to anthropology after lifelong research in paleontology (e.g., Figs. 1-12) including 30 years of direct experience in-the-field across the United States and parts of Canada and in literally hundreds of formations.

Well, it finally dawned on me that after four years of producing newsletters know anything about this background. There is no degree following my name so the only way to give a sense of it all is to tell it; and there is a lot to tell.

Hopefully this series will give the reader a sense of the experience and knowledge that gives me the reasons and confidence to take on at once three science fields—anthropology, biology, and paleontology—which I claim mislead the public about human origins specifically because of their absorption in the idea of evolution and their habit of blocking conflicting evidence or interpretations from the public (e.g., Fig. 4). This is a story with a very personal connection to fossils at its core.

This is not only a story about paleontology, though, but of one that is a blended understanding of fossils and many other things. At its core is a real firsthand sense that there are zillions upon zillions of fossils in miles of stratified sediment and geological formations all over the world easily compared with one another regarding their contents. After 50 years of studying fossils plus understanding that this content is "very" well-known and, for the most part, predictable, that combined with knowledge of nature, philosophy (i.e. Plato), psychology, the arts, musicology from Bach to Metallica, drafting, engineering, exploratory mathematics, and many other things it is clear to me that we are not...
missing zillions upon zillions of fossils evolutionists suggest are just waiting out there to link every single species in a freak chain of events. (Actually, what they propose is one freak change after another for 3 billion years.) The important thing I would like to express is that without an open-ended approach evolutionism bedazzles scientists and it has for 150 years. It is why they block conflicting evidence rather than learn from it. Without any motivation to ignore peer pressure there is little chance of scientists bedazzled by Darwinism to ever investigate a wider view of reality. They want things to be simple and are willing to sacrifice everything else for it.

The series starts with childhood (Figs. 1-3 and 5-6) and an early organization, 1967. We called ourselves the Paleontological Research Committee (Figs. 8-10). 40 years later, science’s misuse of the classroom and, as a response, formation of the Pleistocene Coalition.

Collecting Fossils

As far as physical evidence from the archaeological record goes, people have been collecting fossils for 250,000 years. It is a well-established prehistoric activity with hundreds of fossils collected by Homo erectus, Neanderthals, and Homo sapiens as a single group during the Paleolithic. In fact, fossil collecting is one of the earliest confirmed human activities suggesting an interest in things beyond survival and which can easily suggest philosophical, metaphysical, or simply artistic interests. In this light, collecting fossils is perhaps the only confirmed non-utilitarian activity that links all prehistoric humans together which is one reason the fact creates problems for the evolution community; see Fig. 4, The Impact of Fossils on the Development of Visual Representation. Although the "Fossils" paper, which offers an interpretation of rock art based on actual physical evidence was censored, pop fad neuroscience papers promoting evolutionary rock art hallucinations continue to breeze straight through to publication without a hitch in nearly all anthropology journals. "The Impact of Fossils" presents the case that humans have gradually become aware of many different things through time but are no more intellectually capable now than they were a million years ago. This is a cultural link conflicting with separation between prehistoric people by such as does standard paleoanthropology either in terms of the shapes of skulls or genetics.

There is something about fossils that immediately connects one with all of nature and even with philosophy and everything known in all of reality.

---

**Tales of a fossil collector (cont.)**

"When one splits a layer of shale and discovers a trilobite that has not seen the light of day for 350 million years looking at one how can one not be moved?"

---

**Fig. 6.** Left: My exposure of the Iuka Mississippian-age limestone and chert (c. 340 mya), Mill Creek campground, Iuka, MS, 1967. I felt a very personal connection to this locality returning yearly as we had a family reunion in nearby Iuka (region of my small-part Cherokee-Chocotaw roots). B&W photo by the author (age 13). Right: Two productid brachiopods in matrix (4cm) from this exposure, part of a collection built over the years 1962-1967, consisting of Spirifer, brachiopods, productids, strophomenids; Leptaena, Composita; blastoids; Fenestella broyzoans; and the trilobite, Griffithides. I have collected similar Mississippian fossils in situ across many other southern states including, Tennessee, Missouri, and Arkansas.

---

**Fig. 7.** Left: The author at the Middle Devonian bluffs of Hungry Hollow, Ausable River, Arkona—Ontario, Canada, 1987; Frame from a Super 8 film shot by N. Villoslo. The author first collected fossils from Arkona strata c. 1965 after a family friend gave the author a medium-sized bright-olive-green coiled Phacops trilobite he had discovered there several years earlier (the species are typically black or brown). The fossil was a prize display at many events the author hosted in the late 1970s and early 80s until one night when the green Phacops was stolen, never to be returned. (Once, the author had a large quartz cluster from Arkansas stolen which was returned anonymously several years later.) Right: Two beautiful examples of Arkona’s version of the brachiopod Mucrosipiner showing the gorgeous delicate wingtips (48mm and 38mm respectively) that preserve only when recovered in matrix. The fossils are primarily Devonian Hamilton group which I’ve also collected in Alpena and Milan, Mt; Sylvania, Oh; and Hamilton, NY. Scans by the author.

---

**Fig. 8.** For those of us in the Paleontological Research Committee, and others, taking an occasional risk was a natural part of reaching many little-known localities; otherwise everyone would go there. Here, PRC member G. Borowski, 1975, crosses a Midwest channel not likely crossed in many years. Notice the I-beam bent either by geology or a large falling object. On a different occasion a friend and I took our vans across a similar set of I-beams being guided by those who had already walked across. Reaching obscure sites might include fording streams, plowing through insect-ridden swamps, crossing miles of desert, or climbing goat trails. One instance in the Rockies involved walking a ledge against a rock face with barely enough room for our feet. Needless to say, visiting such localities brings one to places few have ever seen.

---

> **Cont. on page 18**
Tales of a fossil collector (cont.)

Silica Shale of Lucas County

excellent fossils could be found all over the quarry, was on the trilobite Research Committee the board contained current articles, original photog-

raphy and artwork, as well as original recreations of the stratigraphic ledge, by the author, age 13.

Fauna of the Cincinnatian of Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana, see, A Sea Without Fish: Life in the Ordovician Sea of the Cincinnati region, Meyer et al. 2009. The book explains how amateurs helped develop not only Paleozoic paleontology but also modern geological science in general. Much of the fundamental work in U.S. paleontology and stratigraphy was accomplished here. Note! The first known trilobite collected is from a Paleolithitic cave at Arcy-sur-Cure (Yonne) France, appropriately known as “Grotte du Trilobite.” It was collected c. 15,000 years ago and was perforated apparently to be worn as a pendant. Though not as well preserved it is similar to the trilobite in this figure.

Using fossils to serve a political agenda has resulted in one scientific fiasco after another starting from the giddy acceptance of Darwin’s ideas in 1859 to modern examples such as Steven Jay Gould’s admitting there were no transitional fossils yet coming up with the even more biologically unsupportable theory of punctuated equilib- rium or to a frustrated fanatic like Richard Dawkins resolving the problem in his own mind by saying, “We don’t need fossils in order to demonstrate that evolution is a fact. … It would be an obviously true fact even if not a single fossil had ever been formed.” I.e. since the fossil record is a problem the solution is to ignore it. How is it that logical errors this profound develop in the scientific mind? It is because most scientists trained by academia have never spent time with fossils outside of academia. Every- thing they think about fossils comes from academia which has a single mindset. It’s like having an opinion about someone’s ideas without ever hearing them.

My first experiences with fossils were profound with childhood memories sometimes as moving as other experiences. They were not only intellec-
tual but have even included the feeling of being touched.

When one splits open a layer of shale and discovers a tri-
lobite that has not seen the light of day for 350 million years looking up at one how can one not be moved?

Fig. 9. Top: Bulletin board of the Paleontological Research Committee, 1967, in the basement Fossil Museum. Apart from original writings about fossils, the board contained current articles, original photography and artwork, as well as original recreations of world ranges of fossils in the different periods of the Paleozoic era. Bottom: Part of the Fossil Museum of the Paleontological Research Committee, 1967.

Fig. 10. The famous Silica Formation, Middle Devonian shale ledge at Medusa Cement Company quarry—Sylvania, Ohio—during its heyday in 1967. Our primary guidebook was, Fauna of the Silica Shale of Lucas County, Ohio Department of Natural Resources (1927; 1966 reprint). While excellent fossils could be found all over the quarry, collectors went to this ledge when looking for flat Phacops trilobites (or the unfortunate recent re-name to Eldredgeops, just like Platystrophia now Vinitandrostrophia. Let’s vote next time!) in situ. One of our almost finished booklets in the PKC was on the trilobite Phacops collected here. Photo of the stratigraphic ledge, by the author, age 13.

Fig. 11. Left: Ordovician age roadcut on Ohio Route 4, Butler Co., southwest of Dayton, Ohio, 1967; photo by the author (age 13); Right: 450 million-year old trilobite, Flexicalymene sp. (length, 31mm), from this roadcut, 1967; scan 2013. For a superb overview on how amateur fossil collectors played a primary role in developing the concepts and practices of modern paleontology and geol-
yogy via the Cincinnatian of Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana, see, A Sea Without Fish: Life in the Ordovician Sea of the Cincinnati region, Meyer et al. 2009. The book explains how amateurs helped develop not only Paleozoic paleontology but also modern geological science in general. Much of the fundamental work in U.S. paleontology and stratigraphy was accomplished here. Note! The first known trilobite collected is from a Paleolithitic cave at Arcy-sur-Cure (Yonne) France, appropriately known as “Grotte du Trilobite.” It was collected c. 15,000 years ago and was perforated apparently to be worn as a pendant. Though not as well preserved it is similar to the trilobite in this figure.

Fig. 12. The Napier iron mine, Natchez Trace, Tennessee (milepost 381.8), shortly after the Natchez Trace Parkway was opened up. In my opinion, one of the nicer B&W shots you will see of the mine. Photo by the author, 1967. I surveyed along the mine’s perimeter and found fossils in the iron concretions (and almost fell into the mine while taking this picture).
Learn the real story of our Palaeolithic ancestors—a cosmopolitan story about intelligent and innovative people—a story which is 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 with confidence any paradigm promoted as "scientific" that depends upon withholding conflicting evidence from the public in order to appear unchallenged.
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