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Dr. Michael Gramly, PhD (Anthropology, Harvard), describes his experience with the Leakey family in Africa and his recent visits and assessments of presumed Clovis artifacts of undetermined age surface-collected at Harvard Hill in the Mojave Desert near Calico, San Bernardino Co., southern CA. According to Dr. Gramly, the age and cultural affiliation of these 30-40 specimens (prismatic blades, blade cores, etc.) is anyone’s guess, although ordinarily they would be “dismissed” as Clovis. See Gramly p.2.

Xavier Bartlett (Bachelors in Prehistory and Archaeology, Barcelona University) is a prolific Spanish blogger with a long-time interest in the problem of suppression in archaeology and the quest for truth in science. His Spanish commentary on the origins of man issue adapted in English for PCN is well-informed and thought-provoking. See Bartlett p.5.

Engineer and astute rock art researcher, Ray Urbaniak, in two articles first makes a compelling case for intergenerational oral tradition aided by tattoos. He then provides another persuasive rare depiction identification continuing his challenge of mainstream presumptions about early Native American rock art. See Urbaniak p.13 and p.14.

Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre, founding member of the Pleistocene Coalition, at 83 is the last surviving original USGS Hueyatlaco (early man site Mexico) dating scientist. Readers, coworkers, and others continue to express concern about her health and recent stroke and her major backlog of “1600” e-mails. We reprint info from last issue. p.11.

Tom Baldwin provides another surprising look at the mysterious Denisovans leading to his claim that Denisova Cave is the “most interesting place for Paleolithic archaeology in the world today.” The enigma of its startlingly-modern artifacts is amplified by its complex genetic history. See Baldwin p.12.

Richard Dempsey is a prehistorian and dedicated amateur archaeologist of the past 40 years. Among other interests he is an avid collector of Paleolithic artifacts New and Old World with much experience collecting Clovis points and tools in the Mojave, CA. This is Dempsey’s first attempt at describing his artifacts in an academic article. p.15.

Apollo 11’s 50th Anniversary also recalls analysis of the first early geological cores from the moon by the late Dr. Roald Fryxell, designer of Apollo's coring devices and friend and colleague of Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre, co-founder of the Pleistocene Coalition. Ironically, their collaboration to confirm the dating of Hueyatlanco early man site experienced anthropology’s bias and its suppression of a key NASA scientist. See Feliks p.15.

It is hard to believe that 10 years have passed since the July 2009 beginnings of the Pleistocene Coalition. Pleistocenecoalition.com was registered in August and the website was launched in September. Another milestone, perhaps more difficult to believe due to the commitment involved, is the upcoming 10th Anniversary of Pleistocene Coalition News this October. This whole endeavor of bringing suppressed evidence to the public has only been possible due to the cooperation of researchers, writers, editors, and those we appreciate the most—our readers! We hope you enjoy Issue #60.
Presumed evidence of Clovis industry at Harvard Hill, San Bernardino County, California

By Richard Michael Gramly, PhD, anthropology

When an opportunity was presented during 2018 to visit the Mohave Desert and the Calico Hills site as well as other archaeological landmarks, I seized it with relish—recalling Dr. Louis B. Leakey’s ground-breaking involvement in the region more than 50 years ago.

During 1970, while I was working in the National Museum of Kenya in Nairobi, Dr. Leakey sat for his portrait, which (I was told) had been commissioned by California colleagues—most of whom were his admirers and supporters of research at Olduvai Gorge. As an employee of the National Museum of Kenya in 1970–71, I came into contact daily with the extended Leakey family, and most particularly, with Louis’ son, Richard—my boss. In later years I benefited from a grant for New World archaeological research awarded by the Leakey Foundation, then (as now) headquartered in California. Years of fieldwork in south-central Kenya and coastal Tanzania, begun during service at the National Museum, yielded a trove of data; these same data were used for writing my PhD dissertation, which was accepted (1975) by the Department of Anthropology, Harvard University.

My visits to Mohave were in spring, 2018, and early summer, 2019, in the company of prehistorian Richard Dempsey—a life-long resident of Long Beach. During these series of day-trips we were accompanied by well-informed collectors who resided both at the coast and within interior California. I appreciated all the courtesies given to me—the most senior (that is to say, aged!) member of the group.

Our first stop was the Calico (Hills) site, which was closed to visitors, we were told, because of vandalism. Therefore, we were content to canvas the stony desert in its vicinity, paying close attention to open trenches at mining prospects. An array of bifacial and unifacial artifacts plus debitage—none of it diagnostic of culture or age—was everywhere to behold. I did not observe any prismatic blades on the surface, such as the fine specimen with double arises and well-preserved striking platform, which was unearthed 54.5 inches below surface during fieldwork by Ruth Dee Simpson and Dr. Leakey (Bryan 1978: Fig. 6). Of course, the presence of prismatic blades by themselves at open sites is usually not definitive when it comes to dating, as they have been produced for hundreds of thousands of years in places here and there across Africa and Eurasia. In the New World, a prismatic blade industry is known to be associated with older Clovis Tradition sites; however, it can also pre-date and post-date Clovis east of the Mississippi River—as I have argued many times (see, for example, my paper posted to researchgate.com; also, Gramly 2009 and 2012).

Following the course of the Mohave River to the northeast of Barstow, California (Fig. 1) and parallel to the Union Pacific trackway and Interstate Route 15, we next came to Harvard Hill south of the small community of Harvard, San Bernardino County (Fig. 2). Our discoveries at the foot of Harvard Hill along the boundary of public and private land are the focus of this brief report. Additionally, we made visits to nearby prehistoric localities in the Mohave region; however, our observations about them will be presented elsewhere.

Seen from the distance, Harvard Hill (elev. 2,038 feet) is inconspicuous and rises only 300–400 feet from the flatslands (ancient lakebed?) surrounding...
Presumed Clovis industry at Harvard Hill, California (cont.)

The assemblage of artifacts described here was picked up from the surface along the north end of Harvard Hill by the author within a few hours. Undoubtedly small-scale archaeological excavations by trained personnel would yield thousands of additional specimens in the course of a few days. The apron of soil that has accumulated at the foot of the hill might even prove to be culturally stratified.

Harvard Hill chert is semitranslucent and grayish-brown (5 YR 3/2, Rock-Color Chart) in color when fresh. It has a waxy luster. Moderately weathered masses are lighter in color, being light gray (N6) to medium light gray (N5). Faint concentric banding is present in some specimens, and fossils are rare or absent. Jointing, presumably caused by tectonic activity, is pronounced and causes the chert to fall apart into long quadrilateral prisms (Fig. 5). This peculiar habit of Harvard Hill chert renders it ideal for making prismatic blades. Fragments of prismatic blades, exhibiting single and double-arrises (Figs. 6–7) littering the slopes testify that ancient knappers did not overlook the rock’s potential. Wider quadrilateral chert prisms were well suited to biface manufacture as they could be thinned from pre-existing, natural “platforms” at both their ends and sides. Several abandoned bifaces made from wide prisms are illustrated in Fig. 8 (upper row). Their overall shape and basal configuration indicate...
Presumed Clovis industry at Harvard Hill, California (cont.)

"The small assemblage..."

The co-occurrence of prismatic blades, fluted point preforms, ovate knife preforms, and discoidal flake cores at the northern margin of Harvard Hill suggests that we are dealing with a standard Clovis quarry-workshop. Taken individually, these artifact types may be less diagnostic of a specific archaeological culture or restricted period of prehistory. Of course, I prefer to argue that all four types were deposited together as a single event or series of nearly coeval events—and did not accumulate over thousands of years. I base my belief on the facts that all specimens have tolerably fresh, unrolled edges and are weathered to a similar degree; radical differences in their age seem unlikely.

Although archaeological sites with preponderant numbers of Clovis-age artifacts (Llano Complex) are on record in California (Riddell and Olsen 1969), such vestiges are rare and need to be more convincingly dated absolutely (Moratto 2004: 87). In retrospect, the recent discovery at Harvard Hill offers the prospect of supplementing an impoverished data base for California through controlled excavations and timely reporting of research results.
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They are still looking for the origin of man—without much success

By Xavier Bartlett, historian, blogger, Bachelors in Archaeology, Prehistory and Ancient History, University of Barcelona

"Now, to fix this mess, we are told these

Affs. Note: This piece was auto-translated from the Spanish via computer by Xavier Bartlett and adapted for PCN. Translation gram- mar problems, etc., were corrected where possible.

I usually watch for the latest developments in archeology and paleoanthropology to see if academia surprises me with a new scientific approach or revelatory investigation. However, new material seems to repeatedly affirm something I recently wrote that the evolutionary paradigm—even now, still in its teen years—does not hold water. It sinks in the Pacific (and elsewhere) and continues lurking as the controversial origin of man.

Right now, according to information released by many media, an international team of 22 scientists led by archeologist Eleanor Scerri, PhD, University of Oxford, after tidying up the pieces available on the origin of modern man, has come to the conclusion that the old theory of a single place of origin of the human being is no longer tenable.

Recall that for over a century the paradigm has defended a certain evolution that primes in specific regions of Africa had given way to the process of ‘humanization’ in that continent. And from there man is supposed to have jumped to the rest of the continental land masses; This is what is popularly called the “Out-of-Africa” Theory.

According to Dr. Scerri, we have to “radically rethink” the whole issue. From the available evidence (e.g., fossils, artifacts, genetics), the team believes that we are more likely here due to a mosaic of origins of modern humans (“we” being Homo sapiens), although these would still be in Africa, an idea which is not at all challenging to the sacred axiom “Out-of-Africa” hypothesis.

Yes, in a moment of humility, Scerri admits that the idea of a single origin of humans had permeated the minds of people, but maybe the way they had been educated was too simplistic.

Finally, Dr. Scerri, noted that almost all living persons exercise an act of faith when it comes to science and tend to believe everything it tells them, even if they later learn that many of these ideas had proved to be a complete stupidity. The scientists who created and developed the theory of evolution and then the Out-of-Africa vision sold the postulates and continue selling them as demonstrated truths, while other ideas such as creationism are sent to the drawer of undesirable beliefs.

But let’s get to the point. Since the latest archaeological findings have betrayed the presence of anatomically modern humans in African regions as diverse as Ethiopia, South Africa and Morocco, has not been what they will admit is another choice but to say, “Well, yes, there were humans in all these places, and also in times very old” (consider the Michael Cremo and Richard Dullum article and news item in the prior issue of PCN).

To further complicate things, an H. sapiens jaw was recently found in Israel, with an age of c. 200,000 years. Now, to fix this mess we are told these African communities were “pre-sapiens”—just to call them something—and indeed lived throughout the continent experiencing long periods of hybridization and cultural exchanges to finally shape the current modern human. But they also state that the most typical anatomical characteristics of H. sapiens (globular skull, jaw shape, soft supracililar bow, small face, etc.) appeared in different areas and at different times.

The plot thickens. It is then proposed that there was a single core of “important anatomical changes,” that several groups experienced parallel changes and then, over tens or hundreds of thousands of years, were mixing to create a well-defined H. sapiens.

To try to cover this thesis, Scerri stresses to the team the importance of climate change, which caused isolation and approaches among the various communities, which sometimes could be separated by rivers, mountains, deserts, jungles, etc., but under the toughest conditions softened, there could be migration and contacts again. This is supposed to explain the undeniable spatial and temporal diversity in the paleoanthropological record with copies of sapiens separated by vast distances and many thousands of years.
Still looking for the origin of man (cont.)

The scientific conclusions of this team will not go much further and recognizes that there was possibly a great diversity of species or human populations—more than at present—between 400,000 and 200,000 years ago and that all of them would have lived only in Africa, with other relatives being such as Homo heidelbergensis or Homo naledi. To this one might add, as an apostille, whichever is more proven that H. sapiens coexisted in other parts of the world with other hominids such as Neanderthals, floresiensis, Denisovans and even with marginal populations of erectus. Dr. Scerri admits in this context that half a million years or so ago, Neanderthals and sapiens diverged from a common ancestor (what?) and that changes had accumulated over time, bringing an archaic sapiens that should not seem too much like a modern man. In fact, when the skulls of Jebel Irhoud (Morocco) with a dated age of just over 300,000 years were found, at first they took them for some kind of Neanderthals (which, incidentally, have never been identified as such in Africa).

Moreover, Dr. Scerri rightly points out there has been a desire for decades for star-worthy great discoveries to take the upper hand when adjusting Darwinian theory to field findings. So, she does not hide that there has been some egocentric and even trench warfare between teams from South Africa and East Africa in a kind of competition to “find the best” and “be right.” Thus, it was not unexpected to read in the news that a paleontologist and his team declared a hype and have discovered some very unique skull—after which the medal—and have discovered the source that became humanity, or the legendary ‘missing link.’

The recent case of Homo naledi, which aroused expectation, caution, and disdain in equal parts is a good example of this.

To these notes on the current state of affairs, I would add some final thoughts:

1. The “Out-of-Africa” theory itself has been teetering for years because copies of extremely ancient hominids have appeared in different parts of the world. Datings fall under their own weight and can no longer be trusted. In this respect, the alleged migrations from Africa should have happened much sooner than accepted. Moreover, even orthodox scientific fields have begun to suggest the existence of long human evolutionary processes outside Africa, and that this would also involve H. sapiens. The last blow to this field has been the discovery of a set of rough stone tools in China dating no less than 2.1 million years old, which have been attributed to Homo erectus or even Homo habilis (for a mere chronological bias, as is customary3). Finally, to mention scientific chauvinism, China and Asia in general have long been showing significant conflicting evidence and the Western scientific community continues to look the other way.

2. The new proposals on various populations of pre-sapiens that transformed to sapiens as we know constitute a bright fantasy exercise and even a blow to the most orthodox Darwinism. After talking decades of substitution (“improvement”) of species by other natural selection, struggle for resources and survival of the fittest, the role of random genetic mutations, etc., now it turns out that the anatomical and behavioral changes that led to modern humans were the result of crossing and cultural exchange, although it is true that solid evidence to support this proposition is not present. Bravo!

3. However, this position of “diversity” does not clarify at all the origin of modern humans in evolutionary terms, according to the Darwinist axioms themselves. If sapiens came from supposedly “inferior” species such as H. erectus (typically called Homo ergaster if in Africa), should we assume that there were also several groups of early hominids evolved simultaneously in different places and times into “modern” forms? The vision posed by Dr. Scerri is that there was a genetic exchange between populations that we recognize as sapiens (although they were very “archaic”). Then who was there before? What kind of magic evolutionary processes appeared in three areas so remote from each other?

4. The idea that modern humans came out from Africa well defined after the alleged hybridizations is a speculative story. Recall that thousands of years later we are in Europe with ‘Cro-Magnon Man,’ who was a stocky guy with an average height of about two meters. However, modern man seems to be a bit lighter and a reduced version of that modern human. In any case, the racial diversity of modern man in many parts of the world remains a small mystery that nobody has yet unveiled and remains in limbo of adaptive changes to the natural environment, with the usual contribution of random advantageous mutations in either direction.

5. The interpretation of the archaeological record itself could be contaminated by the bias of wanting to see evolution of species instead of a racial or morphological...
Still looking for the origin of man (cont.)

“Dr. Scerri rightly points out there has been a desire for decades for star-worthy great discoveries to take the upper hand when adjusting Darwinian theory to field findings.”

diversity, which is exactly what we see today in human populations. For example, a Nordic white girl could breed today with an Australian aborigine and produce fertile offspring, and no one considers these individuals to be different “species.” Similarly, there are obvious anatomical differences between Neanderthals and H. sapiens but they are known to have interbred as have other human “species.” What is clear is that we cannot have any simian hybridization. Now that’s a difference.

In conclusion, the definition of “modern human” and its association with the idea of an “evolutionary chain” (or the popular variation of an “evolutionary bush”) is still in a stage of uncertainty and speculation, waiting for brilliant new ideas or more or less decisive findings. Meanwhile, it seems that the most rancid Darwinism, with its inferior and superior beings and the prevalence and survival of the fittest, is going down. (Such concepts have already been widely criticized by Professor Maximo Sandin and nothing can improve their arguments4). This reformulation of the classic “Out-of-Africa” just adds nothing significant except the realization that paleoanthropology, in its search for the origin of man, is still lost in his axioms and confusing interpretations of the evidence which is quite scarce and partial. Actually, the hot potato of the matter remains the passage miracle of apelike humans; that is, how and why gender appeared in Homo from assumptions about evolutionary changes in the australopithecines. And today there is no human way to experience, contrast, or reproduce the evolutionary processes by genetic mutations that supposedly lasted millions of years. We are at an im-passe, and anything scien-
tists tell us will be mere conjecture coated with high empirical science.

And while we can clearly see and criticize the opportunism at play in science, I see in this story a sort of multicultural and multiethnic advertising projected onto the past. It fits perfectly into the prevailing political correctness. However, as I pointed out it excludes any non-African factor. Further, it does not explain the tremendous diversity of races of sapiens across the planet nor the origin of modern man himself. In any case, if it is recognized that in the last 300,000 years, human remains show some diversity or mixture of primitive and modern, we might ask how far it is permissible to put well-defined boundaries between species of hominids and seek evolutionary relationships between them.

© Xavier Bartlett 2018, Spanish blog post English-adapted for PCN.


Reference


Endnotes

[1] It is also important to note that just a few decades ago, Homo sapiens was not considered any more than 100,000 years old. Then fossil and genetic evidence was accepted that early modern humans could be traced back to about 200,000 years. After that, findings of human remains in Jebel Irhoud in Morocco have been dated to more than 300,000 years. And finally, other genetic researchers are now suggesting that modern features were already present for hundreds of thousands of years before some diversification or hominid branching was given.

[2] In any case, experts say with the greatest aplomb that the makers of those stone tools “came from Africa.”

[3] In a 2015 article on this blog, “¿Evolución o hibridación?,” I wrote on the opinion of heretical American anthropologist, Susan Martinez, who argues that the diversity of human species was due to successive hybridization not evolution.

[4] See in this blog article Sandín about the origin of man, into three parts [non-working link also missing a title].
Artifact types of the Lake Manix lithic industry

By Richard Dempsey

"That type of wear indicates some kind of gouging activity such as gouging wood."

For the past 30 years (out of 40 as an avid collector of Early Man artifacts both New and Old World) my major area of study and field exploration has been the shores of ancient Lake Manix. Lake Manix is a dried up lake that was present during the Pleistocene age. This general area includes the Calico Hills within the Lake Manix shoreline/beach terrace complex.

The Lake Manix lithic artifacts (stone artifacts) I reproduce in this article represent only a few from a much larger collection. Their makers made them from natural surface nodules that were plentiful to the Pleistocene-age Americans living in the region.

Rough materials
The materials of which the artifacts were made consist mostly of agate, petrified wood, and jasper.

Patination
All of the artifacts in this article are surface finds and are heavily patinated which suggests they have been exposed for some time (e.g., Fig. 1). Patination is a natural process that takes place through exposure to the elements. It adds such characteristics to the artifacts as changes from the original surface colors to orange, white, and sometimes black. It can also include a combination of these colors.

Regarding patina of the artifacts in this pictorial, I observe they are generally more patinated than most Clovis points I have seen. The initial layer of patina in these artifacts is white in color (e.g., see Fig. 2).

The white patina likely formed from sun exposure in a kind of bleaching action. Stone dehydration might also come into play. The orange patina comes from iron oxide in the beach sands and sediments. The black patina (e.g., Fig. 3) may be caused by prolonged contact with organic material (it reminds me of manganese oxide commonly found on Pre-Columbian, Western Shaft tomb terracotta figures). The patina effect is often known by the more informal term ‘desert varnish.’

Production techniques
As far as the production characteristics of the artifacts it is clear they were all made by what is known as percussion flaking. This is the removal of flakes through hitting the artifacts with other hard objects. There is no evidence...

> Cont. on page 9
Artifact types of the Lake Manix lithic industry (cont.)

The artifacts pictured were percussion flaked using hammerstones as striking tools, in other words, stone against stone. **Fig. 5** shows several Lake Manix hammerstones where the use-wear points of impact when hitting the artifacts to flake portions off can readily be seen. **Fig. 6** shows a Lake Manix anvil stone where the artifact is rested while being worked.

Clovis points were both percussion and pressure flaked. **Pressure flaking** is a technique whereby an antler or bone tool was used to push flakes off the artifacts by hand pressure. **Clovis-age resharpening** of worn tools was done by pressure flaking. Earlier Lake Manix artifacts, i.e., pre-Clovis appear to have been primarily resharpened by percussion flaking both direct and indirect (soft) percussion flaking.

**Types of artifacts**

Paleolithic-age artifacts from the Lake Manix area include spearpoints, blades, and adzes as seen on the prior page in Figs. 1–3, hammerstones and anvils as seen on this page in Figs 5–6 as well as handaxes and scrapers are similar to adzes. Adzes and end scrapers are cutting tools similar to the axe but with the cutting edge perpendicular to the handle (if one is present).

Other chopping tools such as seen in **Fig 7**, and end scrapers such as shown on the following page. End rather than parallel to the handle like an axe head. Even though adzes are not

> *Cont. on page 10*
Artifact types of the Lake Manix lithic industry (cont.)

Manix region are in line with what Ruth Simpson of Calico fame called ovate biface foliates. Simpson was the dedicated amateur researcher who introduced Dr. Louis B. Leakey to Calico. Leakey was then able to get a National Geographic grant to study the site and remained involved with Calico until his passing.

- Regarding the spearpoints from the Lake Manix region such as the single example of many which I provide all have evidence of tip impact fractures and one specimen not shown here demonstrates retipping or re-pointing of the point. Archaeologist Michael Gramly, PhD, estimates the age of the spearpoints to be approximately 16,000 calendar years before present.

- Hammerstones such as those shown on the prior page are found fairly commonly on the surface.

- The anvil stone identified by Dr. Gramly is a less common artifact.

- I included two additional stone knife samples here as they demonstrate special features. Fig. 9 is a very good example of the high degree of patination in many of the Lake Manix artifacts. Fig. 10 is an excellent example of a dark patina suggesting antiquity.

"Archaeologist Michael Gramly, PhD, estimates their age to be approximately 16,000 calendar years before present."

Richard Dempsey is a prehistorian and dedicated amateur archaeologist of the past 40 years. Among other more recent objects, he is an avid collector of Early Man artifacts both New World and Old World with much experience collecting Clovis points and tools in the Mojave Desert of California. This is Dempsey’s first effort toward describing his artifacts in an academic setting.

The tools pictured in this article represent a large portion of the known Pleistocene Lake Manix area stone tool kit. They demonstrate great antiquity in their methods of manufacture including their shapes and forms as well as in their extreme patina and weathering. Apart from evidence of older artifacts in the Americas as regularly published in PCN (e.g., Hueyatlaco, 250,000 years), these Clovis or pre-Clovis-age artifacts are some of the oldest in the Americas. I believe they represent some of the most abundant and well-established of ancient American artifacts.
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Latest evidence science got early human migrations wrong
Engineer, Paleolithic theorist, and prolific PCN researcher and writer, Ray Urbanik sends some fascinating news related to a topic regularly covered in PCN by himself, Feliks, and Baldwin. That is the question of how long it really takes humans or animals to “walk” from one region or continent to another. The evidence brought to light in this context casts major doubt on the entire mainstream presumption that it took early humans tens of thousands of years to migrate from one continent to another whether from Africa to Europe, Asia, Indonesia or Australia or from Asia or Europe to the Americas.

The story, reported at abc.net.au/news is called, “Arctic fox sets new record after walking from Norway to Canada in 76 days,” being posted July 2, 2019. Norwegian researchers tracked a juvenile fox by way of GPS. During that time the fox covered more than 3,500 kilometres in a mere 76 days, reaching Canada. It was found to have covered daily distances of up to 155 kilometres. That is the fastest rate ever recorded for the species. Unfortunately, the fox’s transmitter stopped working sometime in February. However, researchers were able to make the astounding conclusion the animal had easily covered a distance of 3,500 kilometers or 2,175 miles.

Ray’s conclusion to the new evidence? “If a fox can cover that much distance in that short a time I think humans could as well.”

See the following PCN articles for evidence on the actual time that would have been involved in early human migrations:
Ice Age animals in Southwest U.S. rock art, part 1 by Ray Urbanik, (PCN #22, March-April 2012);
The straight line route: A different perspective on trekking from Central Asia to the U.S. Southwest (PCN #23, May-June 2013);
The Pleistocene’s most well-traveled creature (PCN #24, July-Aug 2013); and
The myth of millennial migrations (PCN #56, Nov-Dec 2016) and Part 2 (PCN #57, Jan-Feb 2017).

The conclusion based on known facts of foot travel is that early humans could easily have traveled across continents in a matter of months. The hundreds of thousands of years taught by mainstream science does not align with any of the known evidence.

Virginia’s health and recent stroke
For those who have enquired, concerns continue regarding Virginia’s general health and recent stroke. Below is excerpted from last issue for those who have written her or inquired to us. Her recent stroke has added to her already nearly insurmountable difficulties these past few years. Her general health has been an ongoing concern to those who know her or work with her. She is presently unable to keep up with her correspondence backlog. In her last update she was “1600” e-mails behind! To think of this in a positive light, Virginia’s backlog should tell skeptics (including well-known ideological competitors and mainstream publishers) refusing to cite or publish where relevant and in other ways preventing the scientifically-obtained Hueyatlaco evidence from being seen for over 50 years will eventually lose out to an informed public increasingly seeking ‘honest’ anthropology now that they know its opposite is thriving in the Americas. A public increasingly aware anthropology cannot be trusted as a science wants to hear all rigorous evidence. It is part of why Virginia became a founding member of the Pleistocene Coalition. Skeptics able to look away from propaganda can review Virginia’s PCN articles telling in detail the whole Hueyatlaco suppression story from its USGS team and NASA Apollo geologist beginnings to the literal destruction of Hueyatlaco due to the negligence of the U.S. and Mexican anthropology communities. A good place to start is her The Valsequillo and Hueyatlaco story: Overview and links (PCN #39, Jan-Feb 2016). There have been many informative PCN articles from that point forward as well including details on her Hueyatlaco work with the cores geologist for NASA’s Apollo program the same time as analysis of the first cores from the moon. Truth-seekers are listening as can be seen in the From Our Readers section on our website. Virginia is the last of the Hueyatlaco geologists. Not one ever backed down from their dating of the site. –jf

“Since it now appears... mainstream academics are going to have no choice but to accept what you’ve been saying all along...I just hope...it comes out...they refused to give your ideas serious consideration and stood in their way. History has a way of sorting it all out...although vindication sometimes comes too late to be enjoyed by the vindicated...I will continue to spread the word about PCN at every opportunity.” –PCN reader
Denisova Cave, Siberia: Art, craftsmanship, and telling DNA

By Tom Baldwin

"Their art and craftsmanship were much more advanced than that of the Homo sapiens or Neanderthals that lived contemporaneously with them."

The Denisovans, named for Denisova Cave where their remains have been found, were a highly skilled branch of the human race. Their art and craftsmanship were much more advanced than that of the Homo sapiens or Neanderthals that lived contemporaneously with them.

The problem with other finds in the Denisova cave is that over a thousand bone fragments have been found, but they have been chewed by hyenas, and reduced to just bits and pieces of bone. Nevertheless, any bone fragments found were studiously collected. However, there was no way to tell what sort of creature the hyenas had eaten.

Now, a new procedure called 'zooarchaeology by mass spectrometry' has been developed. It looks at the bone collagen in the fragments and from that can determine what type of creature the bone came from. After testing over a thousand samples they found one that was human. It was sent off for DNA testing and it proved to be from a new individual, thus raising the total to six Denisovans. This sixth person turned out to be about 13 years old when she died (Offspring of Neanderthal and Denisovan identified for first time. theguardian.com, August 22, 2018).

All of us living today, of European and Asian descent, have Denisovan and Neanderthal genes in our DNA. The only people lacking those genes are those of us with pure African lineage. It follows, therefore, that a good deal of hanky panky was going on back in the Pleistocene. People of all types where hopping between the bear skin rugs together; but this girl is the first example we have found that is the actual product of such goings-on between different types of hominid.

Once again Denisova Cave has shown itself to be the most interesting place for Paleo-archaeology in the world today.

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 37 prior articles in PCN focusing on H. erectus and early man in the Americas.

Links to all of Baldwin’s articles on Calico, H. erectus, and many other topics can be found at: http://pleistocenecoalition.com/index.htm#tom_baldwin
It is possible that the Clovis/Folsom people—who were generally Nomadic—carried their animal artwork on their bodies in the form of tattoos.

In a June 12, 2019 film clip on Facebook, Iranian archaeologist, Dr. Mohamed Naserifard PhD, posted an interesting photo of the arm of a Lorastan Nomad (Fig. 1).

It shows an ibex image in the form of a tattoo the man would carry with him. As those familiar with my articles in PCN know, the ibex is portrayed in standard rock art form as found throughout the world—including in the Americas.

Upon seeing the image I instantly recalled the idea presented in several of my earlier PCN articles that images of extinct animals depicted in southwest U.S. rock art or of animals that were not extinct but not known from the American fossil record yet appear to be represented in the rock of the American southwest.

Harkening back to one suggestion as to why rock art, apart from such as known from Hueyatlaco carved into mastodon bone when it was fresh is purportedly not known from Clovis-age or earlier sites is due to the nomadic nature of those ancient peoples (i.e. always on the move) or that rock surfaces inclined to preserve such artwork for millennia—as is common in say France and Spain—was lacking in the U.S. is that... It is possible that the Clovis/Folsom people—who were generally Nomadic—carried their animal artwork on their bodies in the form of tattoos. This definitely would have helped carry down the oral traditions of extinct animals if the artwork was also carried down on their bodies (see mammoth image I superimposed over public domain image of a Native American man, Fig. 2).

Ray Urbaniak is an engineer by training and profession; however, he is an artist and passionate amateur archeologist at heart with many years of systematic field research in Native American rock art of the Southwest and other topics. Urbaniak has written over 30 prior articles with original rock art photography for PCN. All of them can be found at the following link: http://pleistocenecoalition.com/index.htm#ray_urbaniak
Possible steppe bison petroglyph, Moab, Utah

By Ray Urbaniak, Engineer, rock art researcher and preservationist

"The extinct steppe bison did roam North America and it more closely resembles the petroglyph image and the Altimira paintings of c. 16,000 years ago than does the modern bison."

The very old petroglyph seen in Fig. 1 photographed near Moab, Utah, by Connie Massingale, is most certainly the image of a bison. One thing leading to that conclusion is the vertical line in the body where the long fur tends to end on some bison. If one further compares the horn size to body ratio, body shape, hump, leg thicknesses, and hind end—including tail—with the steppe bison paintings at Altamira Cave in Spain (c. 16,000 years old) I am certain one will be convinced (Fig. 2).

(Fig. 3). Also, the hump in the modern American bison tends to be more pronounced. I believe it is an important distinction to note that Native American rock art depictions do show horns protruding 'above' the head like in the two rock art images discussed in this article. While the Native American artist may have done this for ease of depiction the horns of most modern bison do not protrude in this way. However, the profile and horns in more recently-created Native American depictions do indeed look like 'modern' bison with horns at the side unlike the steppe bison of Altamira or the Utah petroglyph. The extinct steppe bison did roam North America and it more closely resembles the petroglyph image and the Altamira paintings of c. 16,000 years ago than does the modern bison.

So, we have a petroglyph that appears to depict an "extinct" steppe bison. This suggests either an extremely old age or the idea that steppe bison survived longer in the Americas than believed. I have discussed the latter regarding other American petroglyphs in earlier issues of PCN. One of the reasons includes the idea that the animal was seen in the vicinity by the person creating the petroglyph or observed in another location before they moved to where they made the petroglyphs, even a different continent. Another point is that the animal could have lived in the new area despite no fossil having yet been found. See, my article titled, "Refined thinking regarding Ice Age animals in rock art" PCN #52 (March-April 2018).

A recent discovery easing the extinction date for steppe bison is a 9,300-year-old mummy found at Yukagir, Siberia. From Siberia it was only a short hop over the Bering Land Bridge to the Americas.

While hiking the river with my son and grandson recently my son found a leg bone appearing to be that of a cow. However, on closer examination I realized it was petrified. It appears it could be the leg bone from a steppe bison suggesting the animal was in this area at some time in the past.

Ray Urbaniak is an engineer by training and profession; however, he is an artist and passionate amateur archaeologist at heart with many years of systematic field research in Native American rock art of the Southwest and other topics, Urbaniak has written over 30 prior articles with original rock art photography for PCN. All of them can be found at the following link: http://pleistocenecoalition.com/index.htm#ray_urbaniak
Publication bias in anthropology How the work of famed stratigrapher, Roald Fryxell, has been selectively blocked

By John Feliks

“We couldn’t have asked for a more experienced colleague.”

Publication bias is when the likelihood of whether or not something will be published is not a matter of the quality of the work or even the reputation or objectivity of the researchers but depends upon whether the evidence favors the dominant paradigm. Say, as in the case at hand, you’re a mainstay anthropologist journal committed to no early peoples in the Americas—as most of them are (and all mainstream journals echo each other)—the modus operandi is to simply block from publication any evidence that the Americas had early peoples just like Africa, Europe, Asia and Indonesia. Since this evidence is withheld from the public either by blocking papers, refusing to cite relevant evidence, or by denigrating the evidence or researchers themselves the public is easily duped into believing that the dominant paradigm must be true. Make no mistake this is not science, especially in the cases of anthropology and paleontology and is one of the biggest reasons anthropology especially can no longer be trusted as science.

Like what happened to Dr. Louis Leakey, the most famous well-published anthropologist, highly praised until his acceptance of Calico Early Man Site (Barstow, CA), the same happened with Dr. Roald Fryxell, renowned stratigrapher of the Apollo Program (Figs. 1–3 and Figs. 5–7), discoverer of the oldest human remains at the time in the Western Hemisphere at Marmes Rockshelter, WA (Fig. 4), and friend and colleague of Pleistocene Coalition founding member, Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre. Like the USGS geologists and geochemists who dated Hueyatlaco early man site, Mexico, at c. 250,000 years old, Fryxell and the others had no trouble collectively publishing hundreds of ‘peer-reviewed’ papers including in Science and Nature as long as they were providing what the mainstream wanted to hear. That changed when they dated Hueyatlaco early man site. The 1973 Steen-McIntyre/Fryxell/Malde paper confirmed a date older than ideologically-accepted mainstream wanted to hear. That changed when they dated Hueyatlaco early man site. The 1973 Steen-McIntyre/Fryxell/Malde paper confirmed a date older than ideologically-accepted mainstream did not want to hear. Only a ‘hard science’ geology journal would accept it. That act—since it provided evidence the mainstream did not want to hear—resulted in professional blockades including questioning the geologists’ scientific integrity, the same ploy played on Louis Leakey for Calico including attacks on his mental state. A couple of these geologists published complaints in PCN before they passed. Dr. Charles Naeser—fission track pioneer—in 2011 wrote, Thoughts on the geochronology at Hueyat-laco: How solid geochronology got trashed (PCN #11, May-June 2011 reprinted PCN #49, Sept-Oct 2017, 8th Anniv. Issue featuring a few words from Virginia). Dr. Sam VanLandingham, renowned diatomist, and founding member of the Pleistocene Coalition published many PCN articles expressing dissatisfaction.

> Cont. on page 16
Publication bias in anthropology: Roald Fryxell blocked (cont.)

Fig. 5. Left: Armstrong and Aldrin rehearsing core tube assembly etc., which Dr. Fryxell taught the astronauts as part of his work in the Apollo Program (ap11-S69-31206). Middle: Armstrong practices photo documentation for when Aldrin extracts cores on the moon. Aldrin has just driven the core tube with a hammer; April 1969 (ap11-S69-31120). Right: Aldrin extracting Moon Core Sample 1 (AS11-40-5964). Despite expertise like this in 1981 anthropology again ignored VSM’s, Fryxell’s and Malde’s dating of Hueyatlaco. All crops by the author.

Fig. 6. Apollo 11 Commander and ‘First Man on the Moon’ Neil Armstrong with geologist, the late Dr. Roald Fryxell, at the Seminar on Space Exploration, Augustana College, Rock Island, IL, Feb. 1972. Photo describes as to whether evidence regarding early humans is published or not is predetermined by whether one’s own evidence supports mainstream propaganda or fads. (Fads include such as the ‘final word’ in rock art = entoptic phenomena or phosphenes fad.) If it doesn’t, it is not published or cited, but rather blocked, denigrated, or plagiarized such as converting original ideas into neuro-fad without citation of ones sources. Non-citation of relevant evidence is one of the major problems adding to the promulgation of bias in anthropology. It is very important to address this problem as bias can damage evidence is one of the major problems adding to the promulgation of bias in anthropology. It is very important to address this problem as bias can damage

“Publication bias occurs when the probability of publishing a result…is influenced by the result obtained. It appears to be common and can produce misleading conclusions…and ultimately undermine the credibility of science in general.”


And further:

“Publication bias threatens the ability of science to self-correct. …If only positive findings are published, the risk of these ‘facts’ being false is substantial. A modeling study showed that unless a sufficient proportion of negative findings are published, false claims can indeed become accepted as fact.”


Virginia Steen-McIntyre on when Dr. Fryxell joined the 1973 Hueyatlaco team

“Hal [H. Malde, distinguished USGS geologist] and I obtained permission in early 1973 from the Mexican government for a geological excavation at Hueyatlaco [returning to confirm dating]. We were joined by my old boss from…USGS Laboratory of Anthropology, Roald Fryxell. Fryx had become world famous for his ability as a micro-stratigrapher…and had been working for NASA on the lunar regolith samples and training Apollo astronauts in sample collecting techniques…[e.g., Figs. 5–7]. We couldn’t have asked for a more experienced colleague.”

–Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre, The Valsequillo Saga and Hueyatlaco Site: VSM or Fails (PCN #11, May-June 2011).

In two prior articles, Who would not trust NASA moon rock experts to date rocks on Earth? (PCN #53, May-June 2018) and, Suppressed by the U.S. anthropology community Dr. Roald Fryxell’s science top notch (PCN #54, July-August 2018), I provided other information on Fryxell’s simultaneous involvement with Apollo and Hueyatlaco. The latter also provides samples of Fryxell’s moon core stratigraphy and stratigraphic profiles of Hueyatlaco site prepared with the aid of his colleague Virginia Steen-McIntyre. The side-by-side comparison shows there was no difference in the meticulous precision Fryxell applied to his moon core stratigraphy and his work at Hueyatlaco yet the bias-driven field of American anthropology continues to make a distinction and remains determined not to consider the extremely old dates provided by the best geologists in the country. In this light, all claims made by the field regarding the Paleolithic past need to be reassessed objectively.
Learn the real story of our Palaeolithic ancestors—a 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.