- Challenging the tenets of mainstream scientific agendas -

With revving bulldozers breathing down their necks, quick-working contract archaeologists often barely have enough time to throw important finds into bags and then get off of inconveniently-discovered sites as quickly as possible. See stories by Marilyn Jesmain, PhD (p. 2), and David Campbell (p. 8).

The suppression of evidence in science is not only the mainstream against challenging ideas but also mainstream against mainstream and usually for political reasons (see Tenodi, p. 17).

Archaeologist Chris Harkaker expounds on the mainstream art of ignoring already-established relevant evidence of very early Americans (p. 11).

Engineer and rock art preservationist Ray Urbaniak suggests the possibility that stories passed down across generations through oral tradition might be represented in U.S. rock art (p. 13).

Kevin Lynch and Richard Dullum continue in the footsteps of British amateur archaeologist James Reid-Moir who out-guessed the mainstream science community 100 years ago predicting ancient Pleistocene man in the U.K. (p. 4).

Virginia Steen-McIntyre on the presence of mammoths and their likely fellow travelers over the Bering Strait Land Bridge (p. 10).

Partially mineralized jawbone from Red River, Fannin County, Texas, resembling the Brownwood Skull and found just a few counties away from the Brownwood site. See story by David Campbell (p. 8).
Bairoil, Wyoming: A potential U.S. site plowed under

By Marilyn Jesmain, PhD, archaeologist

From 1984 to 1989, I was a “dig-bum.” As a contract archaeologist, I worked in every state from North Dakota to Southern California and from Washington State to Texas and all points in between. I eventually ended up in Alaska, where I went back to college to receive my PhD at the age of 69. This was at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, in 1998. I am now 84.

One of my most interesting “digs,” if you can call it that, was at Bairoil, Wyoming (Figs. 1–3). John and Mavis Greer, whose offices are in Casper, WY, hired me during the summer of 1988 to work on a site that was rapidly being destroyed due to oil development. I parked my old Airstream travel trailer behind the Caspar Museum, where I volunteered on weekends.

The Bairoil site is in Sweetwater County, Wyoming, 90 miles southwest of Casper. We would drive down every morning to recover what we could before it was destroyed by the massive machinery and oil rigs that were everywhere.

It was crazy; our tools were a large plastic bag and shovel. My partner and I would locate a fire pit and as fast as we could, shovel its contents into the bag all the while a large bulldozer (see Fig. 1 in the upper right) would be poised nearby, revving his engine waiting for us to finish so he could plow it all under.

The town of Bairoil is a small village, population 97 (2000 census), in the middle of a large flat plain surrounded by high mountains at the northeast edge of the Great Divide Basin. It housed the oil workers who were developing the rich deposits under the valley floor. The site had been archaeologically surveyed and cleared years before, but because the surrounding mountains had left a foot or more of deposit, nothing was found and it was cleared for oil development. However, once the surface had been scraped, it proved to be a treasure of information.

Driving into the valley, dirt roads crisscross the entire area. About every quarter mile there was a pole with a gas monitor on top to let you know if there was a dangerous gas leak nearby. The trailer house town stood in the center of all this, housing families and children, with a school, a post office, and a commissary.

Just working there was scary, yet people were living in the middle of this massive hazard.

I have tried to find a copy of this report to check my memory, but though Greer

> Cont. on page 3
mentions this, there does not appear to be much information available. It is now over 25 years since I was there, but this is what I remember. The valley apparently served as a trading center for we found remains of at least 5 or more distinct cultures living peacefully side-by-side apparently for the purpose of trade (e.g., Fig. 4). Only one burial was found. It was of a middle-aged male in a fetal position, with no associated artifacts (Fig. 5). His remains were carefully excavated and sent to the state office in Cheyenne. George Frizen was the State archaeologist at the time. During examination, a tiny obsidian point was found wedged in his knee. The point was quickly transported to me up in Casper, where I did the analysis and drawings. I was the site illustrator. All the time this was happening, the local tribes were fighting to get the bones repatriated for burial. Politics and oil development have now buried this site forever, but this might possibly have been one of the most important sites in all of North America since so much was found even under such rushed and pressured circumstances. It is like many other sites in the Americas which, for one reason or another, never receive a full and patient treatment. Who knows what else could have been found at the site or how far back it goes.

Marilyn Jesmain, PhD, is an archaeologist, explorer, and Professor Emeritus at UNM Taos. She has worked at many sites throughout the U.S. from Texas to Alaska. Jesmain also believes she has found the only recorded U.S. menses site. A quickly made walk-through film of the site called Archaic Women’s Menses Site can be seen on YouTube at the following link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gt0TyhK22-4

Editors note: A very interesting and brief article about the importance of contract archaeologists, Shovel Bums: Inside the world of contract archaeology, can be seen at http://archive.archaeology.org/0803/abstracts/shovelbums.html

“The archaeologists whose careers are spent digging test pits within view of antsy bulldozer operators and moving from one project to another are all but invisible to the public eye, despite the fact that they are responsible for safeguarding much of the country’s heritage.

PCN is interested in hearing from other contract archaeologists as well. This could be an important untapped resource concerning prehistory.
Following Moir along the Norfolk coast at West Runton and Cromer

By Kevin Lynch and Richard Dullum

As we have previously shown, Ipswich Man (a modern-type human) was found covered with boulder clay at a site that also yielded human bones of two other individual humans, both of modern type.

After reading Michael Cremo’s and Richard Thompson’s tome, Forbidden Archeology, and becoming fascinated by the discoveries of James Reid-Moir in East Anglia, I teamed up with Kevin Lynch who, so far as I know, is the only archivist of Moir. Lynch is an amateur archaeologist, photographer, lithologist and flint-knapper residing in East Anglia. Together, we have researched the times, the publications, the artifacts, and the human remains discovered by Moir. Kevin has visited the sites of Moir’s excavations, as well, recovering similar artifacts (e.g., Fig. 1) from the same strata identified by Moir at the very sites Moir excavated one hundred years prior.

One of the central tenets of scientific investigation is repeatability, the ability of independent scientists using the same methods, to come to the same conclusions, in this case, finding similar man-made implements, just as the original finder did. In the case of Darmsden Pit excavations by Moir, re-excavation (by nature at the site), or in this case, a mere visit, resulted in an implement being found from Tertiary gravel, very similar to the museum pieces from that site, which were also rediscovered by Kevin in the Ipswich Museum basement.

After the discoveries by mainstream archaeologists this past decade of both implements and human footprints in the Cromer Forest Bed Formation at Happisburgh on the Norfolk coast it’s pretty hard to deny that humans were already there in the vicinity of a million years ago.

As we have previously shown, Ipswich Man (a modern-type human) was found covered with boulder clay at a site that also produced human bones of two other individual humans, both of modern type. A site excavated nearby at Woodbridge yielded human bones and the tusk of Elephas meridionalis, an early Pleistocene species. It was recovered from the same strata as Ipswich Man. The boulder clay covering Ipswich Man was left after the Anglian Glaciation melted northwards, around 440,000 years ago. Before that time, possibly as early as 800,000 years ago, Britain was arctic. Graves could not be dug in frozen ground. By 850,000 years ago, scientists find boreal species pine cones along with humanly-worked tools, meaning that humans were living in a boreal environment, similar to Scandinavia has today. This type of climate requires humans living in it to have clothing, which is something we tend to associate with modern man. And even at 850,000 years ago, these humans were probably living in shelters they built cooperatively, meaning they had language, something we also tend to associate with modern humanity. Still, within an earlier Cromer Forest Bed layer dated to around 950,000 years ago, in Cromer estuarine mud flats exposed by the North Sea, the British...
Following Moir along the Norfolk coast (cont.)

Museum managed to photograph 54 human footprints before they were washed away by the tide. This places humans who had very modern-looking footprints in Britain right around a million years ago. During this time Britain was cooling off from a tropical environment in the very early Pleistocene, as noted by Moir’s finding of monkey bones in the Cromerian layers. Moir excavated the same sites one hundred years earlier than the mainstream archaeologists are presently excavating today. Why does he not get the credit for being the first discoverer?

Actually, Moir did get a little, grudging credit after the first discoveries made by Parfitt, et al., at Happisburgh, Norfolk. As noted in one of our earlier articles titled James Reid-Moir was right on track 100 years ago by 850,000-year old footprints recently discovered in Happisburgh, Norfolk, U.K., (PCN #28, March-April 2014) a mainstream publication, Current Archaeology (Vol. 210, Jan-Feb, 2006) gives Moir at least a “partial rehabilitation.” The one-page leaf features a coastline shot of West Runton beach, which was a site excavated by Moir, but not at the time visited by ourselves. As West Runton was chosen for the backdrop for the Moir ‘partial rehabilitation’ article, this site, which bears the Cromer stratigraphy used by the British Museum to date the footprints, suggests a need for re-investigation. To that end, Kevin made multiple trips to West Runton and Cromer on the Norfolk coast (Fig. 3), which sites bracket the BM footprint site on the north and south coastline. At both places, he followed Moir’s directions closely to find the remains of his sites, and proceeded to find many types of humanly-made stone implements, some of which we feature in this article (see Fig. 1 on the preceding page, Fig. 4 at left, and Fig. 6 on the following page). The number of the implements collected from the chalky basins at West Runton, as featured in a close-up of the beach area (Fig. 5 on the following page) was close to one hundred objects, which included debitage. The basins collect heavier objects, like the boulders from the once-overlying boulder clay. Retaining stone objects, as the ever-rising seas pushed tides and storms inland, scouring the sunken surfaces down to chalk, the stone implements settled down to the sandy bottoms of the chalk basins. Removing the boulder material, artifacts are found in the sandy layer underneath. Moir reported the sandy layer as thick as 18” but it is considerably less today.

If evidence of early man is to be actively sought for, we, having found Moir’s excavations to be on the spot, suggest looking where he found his implements and other evidence of early man. Certainly, his evidence for Cro-
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merian Man is right in line with evidence discovered lately in Britain, very near his sites, and in the same stratigraphic position. Every time Kevin visits these areas, he finds artifacts. Think what a professional archaeo-
logical team could do at these sites with all this surface evidence practically lying about? If this were the case in Africa, I can guarantee there would be excavation!!

"If evidence of early man is to be actively sought ... we... suggest looking where [Moir] found ... evidence of early man."

Discussion

We see by the types of implements collected on these Norfolk beaches, near the cliffs, in the chalky pothole sands, under the boulders, that early man was here long enough to establish a considerable stone tool industry. All the pieces featured here show unmistakable signs of human workmanship from the 'crudeish' flint nodule, to some of the more finished and sharper scrapers and knives. These tools all are typical forms of flint tools found at other Paleolithic sites around the world, as the side-by-side comparison in Fig. 1 of a West Runton 'hollow' scraper and an Egyptian paleolith from the British Museum shows. In light of this and much more evidence we wonder how can mainstream archaeologists stay away from these indications of a rich excavation to be had? As shown in the paleomap of Fig. 3, these sites including West Runton and Cromer were all quite a distance inland during the Early Pleistocene. West Runton also has the remains of a paleo-river which flowed East-West, making it a location we might expect to find traces of hunter-gatherers. The potential for such productive sites is clearly increased as we follow Moir's footsteps; others should take note.

KEVIN LYNCH is a retired British businessman, an amateur archaeologist, archivist and member of the Prehistoric Society of Britain. An avid collector of flints from his local countryside and beaches, he and his wife live in Hadleigh, Suffolk, UK. Lynch's specialty is British archaeology of the late 19th and early 20th centuries concentrating on the life and works of J. Reid-Moir. He and Richard Dullum have lately blended their interests in prehistory to write a series of articles dealing with the hey-day of British archaeology at the turn of the 20th Century.

RICHARD DULLUM is a surgical R.N. working in a large O.R. for the past 30 years as well as a researcher in early human culture. He is also a Vietnam vet with a degree in biology. In addition to his work with Lynch, he has written seven prior articles for PCN.

All of Lynch and Dullum's articles about Classic British Archaeology in Pleistocene Coalition News can be found at the following link:

http://pleistocenecoalition.com/index.htm#Dullum_and_Lynch

Fig. 5. Top: Overhead longshot view of chalk exposure on the Norfolk coast as taken from the top of the West Runton Cliffs. Bottom: Closeup of the chalkbed as seen in the lower left hand corner of the top picture. The finds are in pockets of the chalk area below those covered in seaweed (the darker parts of the picture). They are not found anywhere else on this beach thus far other than an area about 25yds X 20yds, with the chalk "pool" in the center areas.

Fig. 6. This flint nodule was found on the same trip in July 2015 where Kevin Lynch found also a flint triface. Again, this artifact shows multiple signs of human workmanship. It was found in another hole in the chalk-pan, under the sand and boulder. Like the similar triface artifact, it fits perfectly in the hand. It is quite suitable for fairly heavy jobs. It is also the same black flint that the mainstream found at several nearby areas.
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CORRECTION for PCN #37 regarding Fred Budinger’s announcement that the Calicodig.org website is back up and running:

"I saw in the Pleistocene Coalition News that the Calicodig web site is back up, and I found that it is, but the note in the newsletter credits it to the two of us [Fred Budinger, Ted Oberlander] and ‘Lee Dexter,’ ... Could a correction be published in the next PC News?"

-Ted Oberlander

Installation artist and theorist on prehistoric language, Michael Winkler, writes regarding some of his new work on language, images and signs, and continues to challenge the ideas of modern linguistic founder Ferdinand de Saussure:

New Discoveries Should Re-open the Discussion of Signs
By Michael Joseph Winkler


Winkler writes in his announcement:

"I was supposed to focus this article on the philosophical implications of my ongoing process-based exploration of language and image, and I did do that, but I couldn’t resist also taking the opportunity to slam the Saussurian foundation of contemporary cultural theory one last time."

"I admit that I have a vested interest in seeing the demise of Saussure; but I’m telling you, sooner or latter, the current Saussurian-based approach to the critical evaluation of contemporary art is going to bite the dust because it’s lost its foundation.”

E-mail: Michael Winkler
m.winkler@yahoo.com

See also Michael Winkler’s Ancient art and modern language (PCN #5, May-June 2010).

Mainstream quotes of the day –JF

"If current loose standards for defining hominid species were applied at the San Diego Zoo, each mammal species would need five more cages."


“What is extraordinary about these early communities of small arthropods is not how different they are from their equivalents in the living world, but how remarkably similar.”


[The only reason similarities might seem “extraordinary” or “remarkable” is the imagined evolutionary notion that they should be different.]

"We can imagine a whole range of flippers and fins that might be transformed into legs and hands.” —ibid. p 149. Dr. Fortey’s own emphasis

“When we look at any paleoanthropological—or other—question, we need always to examine our preconceived beliefs. ... We may be unaware that they are preconceptions.”

–Ian Tattersall, PhD, famed anthropologist, Amer. Mus. of Nat. Hist. The strange case of the rickety Cossack and other cautionary tales from human evolution, 2015: p. 44.
The Brownwood Skull
By David Campbell

In the last Pleistocene Coalition Newsletter I profiled Cyrus Ray, founder of the Texas Archaeological and Paleontological Society. In that article I made passing mention of documented discoveries made by Ray and other founding members of the Society that would be relegated to the fringe by most members of today’s Texas Archeological Society. It is ironic to note that Cyrus Ray and his associates were doing their best to establish credibility with the staid East Coast establishment by adopting accepted scientific methods and standards. Still it seemed that the ground truth of many of their discoveries out here on the physical fringes of civilization conspired to keep them on the intellectual fringes as well. There are many strange accounts buried in the old Bulletins; this is one of them.

It was late in the year of 1932 that Cyrus Ray read an odd newspaper account of human bones that had been blasted from a solid limestone boulder near Brownwood, Texas. Cyrus found the story to be highly improbable but his curiosity got the better of him. The ninety mile trip from Abilene down poorly paved roads to Brownwood was no step for a stepper such as Ray.

Arriving in Brownwood, Dr. Ray immediately began rounding up the finders and taking their statements while the facts were still fresh. Thereafter he visited the site of the bones in their company and took careful measurements as he always did. Later others visited the site and filed a report in “Science Service” but Cyrus felt that the report omitted significant facts. To rectify that he wrote his own report in the Field Notes and Reviews section of the 1933 Bulletin of the Texas Archaeological and Paleontological Society.

A road crew was blasting away at a ledge of Pennsylvanian (323-298 MYA) limestone formation. The resulting boulders were then taken to a nearby rock crusher. One 12 foot square boulder at the foot of the ledge required further reduction and more explosives were applied. Shortly afterward truck drivers shoveling the fragments into the rock crusher began to notice bones embedded in them. Nevertheless the bones joined the limestone in the crusher to become paving material.

One long bone, that Cyrus judged to be a femur from the description, was thrown out on the road by one of the drivers. Although the foreman stated that it was a human bone, it became part of the pavement anyway. Fortunately...
The Brownwood Skull (cont.)

another driver with a little more snap notified a company official named John O. Palmer. Palmer along with J.H. Arledge walked over to the site and almost immediately picked up a complete lower jaw containing most of its teeth. Part of the frontal bone with a peculiar nasal bone attached was retrieved with it. Though the finders did not consider the bones to be of any great significance, they nevertheless sent it to town with one of the truck drivers. The driver casually tossed it into the back of the truck and in course of bouncing around on the rough gravel roads some of the teeth were lost. At length the bones were taken to a local dentist, Dr. Snyder, where they lay in repose until Cyrus Ray examined them.

Despite other reports stating that the bones were only partially mineralized, Cyrus found them to be hard and heavy, noting that they were similar to other human skull bones from the Texas coast he had in his possession. (At a later date I hope to give a more detailed description of these other skulls from another article in the Bulletin, “Notes on Five Texas Crania” by anthropologist Dr. Ernest A. Hooton.) Though none of the limestone adhered to the bones, the fractured edges were sharp and hard and of the same color as the limestone ledge from which they were blasted. Palmer and Arledge stated that there was no observable fissure in the boulder and no earth or stained stones were among the rubble where they found the bones. They pointed to a small pile of freshly fractured limestone fragments where they had recovered the bones that were of the same light gray color. At

the time Dr. Ray examined the site nearly all the debris of the boulder had been cleared away.

Just opposite from the boulder’s location Cyrus observed that there was a crack in the ledge about a foot wide containing black earth and stained stones but he did not think it necessarily had any connection with the widely detached boulder. Just below the ledge there was a small creek containing water and on the other side, he discovered a burned rock hidden. These are quite common in the Middle Archaic to the Late Prehistoric throughout Texas but again Cyrus could see no direct connection to the ledge site.

Dr. Ray pointed out the obvious to Palmer and Arledge stating that scientists would give no credence to a tale of human bones blasted out of solid limestone over 300 million years old. Both held firmly to their first statements concerning the circumstances of the discovery. Cyrus then advanced an alternate scenario that there could have been a cave that subsequently filled with stalagmitic deposits encasing the bones. Yet he reasoned that since the bones had no signs of matrix adhering to them, this theory was not very reasonable either.

Dr. Ray mused that if the petrifaction of the bones did not evidence their being of great age consistent in color and hardness as the limestone, and if further they did not contain extraordinary anatomical features, he would have dropped the matter then and there. Since they did he felt the bones deserved description (as a reminder, Dr. Ray was an osteopathic surgeon and an expert on bones):

The ascending ramii of the lower jaw were quite wide, the distance across the top of one from coronid to condyle was 2 1/16 inches. The distance from coronid to coronid was 4 13/16 inches. From the bottom of the sigmoid notch to the bottom of the ascending ramus was 2 ¾ inches. From the back edge of the third molar to the middle of the incisors was 2 5/8 inches. The architecture of the lower jaw is heavy resembling in that aspect and in dental equipment some primitive jaws found near Abilene and elsewhere in Texas. The mylohyoid ridge is flattened like the fossil lower jaw found by George C. Martin on the coast of Texas and the lower jaw found by the writer near Colorado, Texas.

Dr. Ray further stated:

The teeth are much worn. In the left side all teeth are present except the two incisors and their jaw cavities indicate that have been lost recently. On the right side the teeth are all in place except the first premolar recently lost, and the broken off canine. The depth of the sigmoid notch is ten sixteenths of an inch.

The large portion of frontal bone has attached in place a remarkable nasal bone which is wide, flat, and spatulate shaped at the end. It also curves sharply upward. It is 1 ¼ inches wide at the proximal or attachment end. When a rule is set with one end against the skull at its articulation with the frontal bone and extended to the distal end
The Brownwood Skull (cont.)

"Despite other reports stating that the bones were only partially mineralized, Cyrus found them to be hard and heavy."

of the nasal bone, the measurement straight across from end to end (not following the marked curvature of the bone) is 1 ¾ inches. This long flat upturned nasal bone is like nothing the writer has ever seen before on a human skull.

Dr. Ray concludes his report by noting how rarely nasal bones are found in good condition due to their fragility. That the Brownwood Skull survived multiple explosive charges and rough handling afterward with minor damage and the loss of some teeth is almost as anomalous as the bones themselves.

In Cyrus’ own words: “We have reported all of the evidence as told to and observed by us without injecting any conclusions and we have none. The matter should be looked into more fully by experts.”

To my knowledge it never was.

There were no photos of the Brownwood Skull to accompany Cyrus Ray’s report. I hope readers will not consider it presumptuous of me to include those of a partially mineralized jaw bone I examined a few years ago (see Fig. 1 on Page 1). It was found on a tributary of the Red River in Fannin County, Texas. A number of its characteristics are similar to those Cyrus Ray described in the Brownwood Skull.

"If mammoths of any kind were wandering the Bering Land Bridge 1.5 million years ago, could mammoth hunters be far behind?"

Mammoth migrations into North America suggest human presence

Virginia Steen-McIntyre

Information source: Laura Geggel, Staff Writer, LiveScience.com

An intriguing note in my November 12 Sigma Xi Smart Brief says that it was probably the cold-adapted Eurasian steppe mammoth (Mammuthus trogontherii) that wandered into North America around 1.5 million years ago, and not its warm-climate ancestor Mammuthus meridionalis, and that it may be identical to the Columbian mammoth (Mammuthus columbi) that ranged across North America during the Pleistocene. This was reported in the November 12 issue of the journal Science by co-researchers Adrian Lister, a research leader of paleontology at the Natural History Museum in London, and the late Andrei Sher, a paleontologist with the Severtsoy Institute of Ecology and Evolution in Moscow.

The study was based on a re-evaluation of fossil mammoth teeth, and the fact that steppe mammoth remains are found in northeast China 1.7 million years ago and in northeast Siberia 1.2 million to about 800,000 years ago. There are no known fossils of the temperate European mammoth that have been found in northeast Siberia or Alaska, “suggesting that this temperate-adapted species never dispersed as far north as the Beringian transit route.”

Why did that catch my interest? Because if mammoths of any kind were wandering the Bering Land Bridge 1.5 million years ago, could mammoth hunters be far behind?

—VSM

References:


DAVID CAMPBELL is an author/historian and an investigator of geological or manmade altered stone anomalies or large natural structures which may have been used by early Americans. He also has a working knowledge of various issues regarding the peopling of the Americas. Along with Virginia Steen-McIntyre and Tom Baldwin, Campbell is one of the core editors of Pleistocene Coalition News. Campbell has also written eight prior articles for PCN which can be found at the following link:

http://pleistocenecoalition.com/index.htm#anarchaeology

Author’s website: anarchaeology.com

Despite other reports stating that the bones were only partially mineralized, Cyrus found them to be hard and heavy."
18,500 BP, Monte Verde, Chile: “It’s evidence we cannot ignore.”

By Chris Hardaker, MA, archaeologist

It’s déjà vu all over again!

18,500 BP is now the official date for two sites in the New World. Both are right next to each other in southern Chile, right next to the South Pole. Actually, they might be locales of the same site. While some dispute all of the lithic artifacts (e.g., Fig. 1) from the site, it was agreed that 35% of the lithic specimens were made from materials that were carried into the region by humans, i.e. man-u-ports. There were two sets of dates for each locale. The US experts could not ignore the younger series of dates. However, they did ignore the older dates. Again.

Monte Verde 2 or MV-2 (18,500 BP; not ignored),
Monte Verde 1 or MV-1 (25,000–33,000+ BP; ignored).

Exactly the same thing happened in 1999.

Same place: Monte Verde, Chile.
Same Archaeologist: Tom Dillehay.
Same US Experts: the Clovis Mafia dons.

Same Point Spread:
MV-2: 14,500 BP; not ignored;
MV-1: 33,000 BP; ignored

It is safe to conclude that Meltzer and the rest of the First American experts:
a) cannot ignore dates under 20,000 BP; and,
b) dates greater than 20,000 BP are officially ignorable. As it was in 1999 so shall it be now.

The US dons know how to wield their academic muscle. Always have, always will. The just have to get together and raise their hands up or point their thumbs down. To ignore or not ignore: that is the question.

This is how science is done in the highest reaches of First American research in the United States. We got the research money and the peer-reviewers, so we get to call the shots for the entire Western Hemisphere (the New World). Life is great, and now history is repeating itself.

Tom’s Dillehay’s curiosity got the better of him after twenty years wondering whether it was safe to return to a site that first seemed to ruin his career, but in the end it actually made his career. In 2013 he returned to this southern Chile outpost to gather more data, including artifacts, but equally important it was a chance to fill in the holes of the incredible geological column containing the sites.

This time Dillehay was applying the newest cutting-edge field archaeology program to this Chilean backwater, an application that is actually catching on around the globe. It is called the De-escalating Intrusive Geology model. Dillehay just had to apply D.I.G. anywhere and he hit paydirt.

The region containing the sites is made up of a vertical string of sediments with plenty of carbon dating back to at least 43,000 years. There were no artifacts recovered from this lowest of the dated layers, at least yet. The fact that datable layers of sediments exist in the first place is an incredible gift to geo-archaeologists everywhere.

What makes Monte Verde the “Belle at the Paleoa...
experts were seduced by free plane tickets to make a field trip to the site. Was it worth it?
As a result, in 1999, twenty years after the original finds were made, Monte Verde became the Clovis First Paradigm Buster, becoming the earliest officially accepted site in the New World. The US archaeologists were hard pressed, though. One was overheard whispering to a colleague, “Funny, it doesn’t look Clovis.”
Monte Verde stone technology was as different from Clovis as you could probably get. It totally closed the door of righteousness in the faces of the Clovis Mafia, but in the end they showed everyone that they were not to be messed with. In the end, the 14,500 dates were accepted. After all, it is only a couple thousand years older than Clovis. The Clovis dons could still salvage their pride. But those 33,000 year old dates? No chance, pal.
So, what did Tom Dillehay have to say when he saw the Clovis Mafia’s great displeasure at the 33,000-year-old dates? Probably something like, ‘sure, why not. I never much liked those pesky 33ky dates anyway. It’s a deal.’
And it happened again, just like that, here in 2015. It is all about censoring yourself so others don’t have to. For example, there is no mention of the ignorable 25,000-33,000 year old dates in his recent abstract, though they are well covered in the text.
Here is another nugget showing how the average archaeologist appeases the ex-Clovis dons who are looking over his shoulder as he writes his report. It shows how Dillehay describes the cultural data garnered from the 33,000-year-old deposit of MV-1. Anywhere else in the world, Tom could have written something a bit easier like: ‘Several stone artifacts were associated with three possible clay-lined hearths.’ At Monte Verde, this description was made much more nebulous and sidewaynder.
“MV-I dated ~33,000 BP and initially defined by scattered occurrences of three clay-lined, possible culturally-produced burned areas and twenty-six stones, at least six of which suggest modification by humans.” 2015: 4/27.
For the second time in so many publications, the most recent dates from a Monte Verde project were promoted, while the equally valid older dates were simply ignored. Officially the term is, ‘Inconclusive.’ Two different projects, same 25,000 BP+ dates, and all lithic artifacts are made out of materials that had to be man-u-ported in. And the conclusion by Meltzer and the US experts:
Nothing to see here.
Inconclusive, ergo ignorable. This means that the combined weight of these separate recoveries and dating regimens are still not good enough evidence to reset the cellar date for American antiquity to 25,000–33,000 BP. With the infamous and extremely ignorable Pedra Furada site (32,000 BP) removed from the table long ago, there are obviously no precedents for the new MV-1 artifacts other than the old MV-1 artifacts. Therefore, they don’t count. Why? Because the US guys said so.
Maybe in twenty years, somebody will decide to go to Monte Verde again.
Welcome to archaeological science, US-Style.
References
Monte Verde, Chile, 2015

http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0141923
http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v332/n6160/abs/332150a0.html

Pedra Furada, Brazil 1986
www.nature.com/nature/journal/v321/n6072/abs/321769a0.html

Valsequillo Reservoir
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koWmElV50
http://www.amazon.com/First-American-Suppressed-People-Discovered/dp/1564149420

Chris Hardaker, BA, MA, 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. For details, see the series, The Abomination of Calico, Parts 1-3, beginning in PCN #6, July-Aug 2010, and Calico Redux: Artifacts or Geofacts: Original 2009 paper updated and serialized for PCN (PCN #24, July-Aug 2013) and its Part 2 (PCN #26, Nov-Dec 2013). For additional in-depth information and quality photographs of tools recovered from the Calico Early Man Site excavations see Calico’s “Double-notched” blades from T-22 (PCN #30, July-Aug 2014) and Calico’s only classic handaxe (PCN #31, Sept-Oct 2014). Hardaker is also author of the book, The First American: The Suppressed Story of the People Who Discovered the New World, for a closer look at Monte Verde.
All of Hardaker’s articles in PCN can be accessed directly at the following link:
http://pleistocenecoalition.com/#the_first_american

The region containing the sites is made up of a vertical string of sediments with plenty of carbon dating back to at least 43,000 years."
More on a Utah rock art panel with a proposed mammoth hunting scene

By Ray Urbaniak  Engineer, rock art photographer and preservationist

In my prior article, I discussed a photo I had recently taken of a proposed mammoth (or mastodon) being hunted with an atlatl or spear thrower. Although there are, of course, many possible interpretations I will stick with this one for now. Fig. 1 from that article is reproduced at right. I reproduce the rest of the panel below in Fig. 2.

The idea that rock art panels of unknown ages in the U.S. could depict Ice Age animals is controversial. However, in this case, as I suggested in earlier articles, another possibility is that descriptions of certain Ice Age animals may have been passed down in oral tradition over time, perhaps over many generations. In such a case, rock art artists wouldn’t necessarily have had to actually see for themselves the animals they were portraying; in some cases they could have depicted something they only knew from oral form. This could help explain the unusual appearances of many such depictions.

I revisited this idea while considering the person who created the proposed mammoth hunting scene because of the unusual nature and positioning of what I am interpreting as “tusks.” In other words, having never seen an actual mammoth tusk, the tusks are depicted as very large horns since horns are what the person would have been familiar with in their everyday life.

In a later article, I will discuss the line which was engraved underneath the animals in the panel.

Ray Urbaniak is an engineer by education and profession; however, he is an artist and passionate amateur archeologist at heart with many years of systematic field research on Native American rock art, especially as related to archaeoastronomy, equinoxes and solstices in Utah. He has noted that standard archaeological studies commonly record details of material culture but overlook the sometimes incredible celestial archeological evidence. Urbaniak has also played a major role in documenting and raising concerns for the accelerating vandalism, destruction and theft of Native American rock art. He has brought state representatives to rock art sites with the hope of at least placing labels as protected nearby what he calls “sacred art” sites as a deterrent to vandalism. Urbaniak’s book, Anasazi of Southwest Utah: The Dance of Light and Shadow (2006), is a collection of rock art photographs which include clear descriptions with many photographs being time-sequenced as events occurred along with compass, angular orientations, and other information. All of Urbaniak’s prior articles in PCN, beginning with Ice Age animals in Southwest U.S. rock art, part 1 (PCN #22, March-April 2013) can be found at the following link:

http://pleistocenecoalition.com/index.htm#ray_urbaniak

Author’s webpage:

http://www.naturalfrequency.net/Ray/index.htm

E-mail: rayurbaniak@msn.com
Debunking evolutionary propaganda, Part 16
Overview and links for Parts 1–15

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

One of the most important questions in modern times is that of our origins and prehistory. In recent years the science community through continuous propaganda has managed to convince many that it has answered the question with evolution. The public is being told that evolution is now established fact. This series provides evidence that the exact opposite is true because evolution is in clear conflict with the fossil record.

Part 1: Basic propaganda techniques in college textbooks (Issue 23:10–12, May-June 2013)

Question: How does one make an ideology claimed as fact appear overwhelmingly true to students never taught how to think critically?

Answer: 1.) Turn science textbooks into propaganda;
2.) Intimidate students who question the propaganda;
3.) Withhold conflicting evidence.

Part 2: Fictions taught as fact in college textbooks, 1st half (Issue 23:16–18, May-June 2013)

The statistic equating higher institutional education with belief in evolution is not an indication of critical thinking as naïvely believed. It is an indication of how captive audience propaganda works.

Part 3: Fictions taught as fact in college textbooks, 2nd half (Issue 24, July-August 2013)

Part 4: Evolutionists are not qualified to assess ‘any’ evidence (Issue 25, September-October 2013)

"The Prezletice human molar has been re-identified as a bear ... and the 'hominid' skull from Venta Micena as a horse."
-Clive Gamble, The Palaeolithic societies of Europe, 1999: 116

"The history of paleoanthropology is one of repeated misidentification of fossil ancestors."


Modern science is in a compromised state having descended to the level of adopting use of well-known propaganda techniques to promote the ideology of Darwinism (that complex life and intelligence “evolved” from a batch of chemicals). In the Next Generation Science Standards this ideology has been interwoven with actual facts in a way that deceives anyone not objectively informed about fossils. 95% of the propaganda techniques described in Part 1 are in the document. Americans need to recognize that the “Standards” for biology—legislation to force evolutionism on students while blocking them from conflicting evidence—is corrupted science. They are the result of decades of textbook fraud and a lack of perspective regarding the fossil record. Any grade school subject depending upon tactics such as those discussed is not ready to be taught as science.

Part 6: The inconvenient facts of living fossils: Brachiopoda (Issue 28, March-April 2014)

From the very beginning, Darwin knew he had a big problem—the fossil record. According to paleontology’s own numbers it can plainly be seen that the fossil record is not a record of species, genera, families or orders—but alone classes or phyla—evolving one into another but a very clear record of thousands of well established organisms which have not changed for tens to hundreds of millions of years.

> Cont. on page 15

The field is "anthropology." Anthropology—the study of "humanity"—has a long history of deceiving the public. It is a powerful tool for manipulating both cultural and personal identity.

In the October 2009 issue of the journal Science, evolution-trained scientists were quoted that Ardi (A) "doesn't look much like a chimpanzee ...or any of our closest living primate relatives,” e.g., (B). –Ann Gibbons

Regarding the famous 3.6 million-year old Laetoli human footprints (B), evolutionists actually teach they were made by (A) australopithecine apes, rather than by (C) humans.
Overview and links for Parts 1–15 (cont.)

Part 7: " " **Mollusca** (Issue 29, May-June 2014)

"Like brachiopods, molluscs ... provide for an excellent, unbroken fossil record from the Cambrian to the present. Most of the classes of molluscs living today... were already present in the Cambrian."

- Animals Without Backbones, Buchsbaum et al 1987, Third Ed., p. 520

"If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties ... must assuredly have existed; ... evidence ... could be found only amongst fossil remains."

- Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species, 1859, p.179

Parts 6–12 are based on the main volumes of the Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology. I have also proposed an expanded definition of the term living fossil to reflect the true facts of the fossil record. This is to include organisms with remarkably long histories even though they eventually went extinct. Noting that this definition is based on date ranges which are agreed to by international consensus it can be stated that all taxa remain the same since their first appearance. In other words, they do not evolve. The three fossil snails at left extend from the Early Cambrian (542 million years ago) to the Present. They demonstrate a clear continuity through time. Such continuity is not helpful to Darwinism and so it is concealed through obfuscations in the taxonomic naming systems used in biology, paleontology, and anthropology. In these evolution-corruputed fields, if necessary evolutionary categories are not found, they are simply created.

The top two fossils are not only called different species, but different genera, different families, different orders, and even different subclasses. The bottom fossil is regarded as a different class entirely. The public needs to realize that they’ve been railroaded. Think dog breeds not evolutionary genera or classes.

Part 8: " " **Porifera and Cnidaria** (Issue 30, July-August 2014)

"Modern corals... may have evolved from some nonskeletonized common ancestor that existed in the Paleozoic but left no fossil record."

- Bruce L. Stinchcomb, geologist, paleontologist

This is a standard trick in Darwinism to explain why evolutionary claims do not match the physical evidence of the fossil record. It is applied by mainstream PhDs trained in biology, paleontology, and anthropology to every single creature and every type of creature known. Paleontologists cannot explain the origins of any organisms without recourse to a pantheon of invisible "unknown" ancestors. Yet, they can tell you the exact date range to the decimal of when fossilized creatures lived. This means that their desired explanation does not match their accrued facts.

Part 9: " " **Echinodermata** (Issue 31, September-October 2014)

"The apparent first appearance of a crinoid occurs in the Lower Ordovician of England. ... It was not an intermediate form. It was not a primitive link with older ... ancestors. The lack of a sequence of transitional types leading back to the ancestral stock is, of course, the chief reason for the uncertainty about origin of the class."


**Question.** According to the physical facts of the fossil record (not imaginary family trees, extrapolations from genetics, or other tricks of the Darwinism trade), what are the ancestors of the echinoderms—crinoids, starfish, and sea urchins?

**Proposed answer.** Crinoids, starfish and sea urchins.

Echinoderms appeared hundreds of millions of years ago and survive today. And like all invertebrates, the origin of these creatures is a frustration to scientists incongruously teaching evolution as fact. Tasch’s description implying that the ‘intermediate’ ancestors of other animals are less uncertain than those of crinoids is misleading because not one has been established. Sciences that teach as fact the opposite of what the cumulative physical evidence actually says need to be questioned. It doesn’t matter how many adherents there are.

Part 10: " " **Bryozoa** (Issue 32, November-December 2014)

"Bryozoa is one of the most puzzling phyla in the animal kingdom and little is known about their evolutionary history."


The title of the above paper might make readers imagine that science is on its way to explaining bryozoans in evolutionary terms. This is not the case. Although paleontology and biology consider bryozoans—or moss animals as they are popularly known—to be primitive, simple organisms that evolved like everything else in the Darwinist worldview, the actual real-time facts of the fossil record tell a different story. What the record actually shows is that after nearly 500 million years bryozoans are still bryozoans—just like when they first appeared. They didn’t evolve from anything else; nor did they evolve into anything else. The quote itself may seem innocuous but it uses two standard tricks that prevent readers from considering bryozoans objectively: 1.) "little is known," but truly nothing is known about the so-called evolutionary history of bryozoans. The problem, as in all such papers, is that evolution is presented as a ‘given’ despite the fact that not a single group of organisms has been established in evolutionary terms; and 2.) is the misleading implication that bryozoans are a uniquely puzzling group. This too is a standard technique used in the community. The idea is to imply that evolutionary histories for organisms other than the ones you are currently talking about are established, which, again, is not true.

> Cont. on page 16
Overview and links for Parts 1–15 (cont.)

Part 11: """Arthropoda" (Issue 33, January-February 2014)

"So where did trilobites come from? ...The evidence is neither clear nor unambiguous."
- Sam Gonn III, PhD, biologist; trilobite authority, and webmaster of the comprehensive resource trilobites.info

Dr. Gonn’s statement about the mysterious origins of trilobites should have a familiar ring to it. As pointed out earlier, this is the same observation made of all organisms. But the public doesn’t know it because it is routine in the evolution community to admit “problematic evolution” for the organism at hand while implying that other organisms have been figured out in evolutionary terms. Proof of evolution has not been established for a single group—not one species, genus, family, order, class, phylum, or any other category.

Part 12: """Trace fossils & graptolites" (Issue 34, March-April 2014)

Trace fossils, except for footprints, are little known to the public. They concern the passage of time. Trace fossils represent the actual activities or experiences of ancient organisms as they went about their daily lives. They include tracks, burrows and borings, and even records of unusual events that might only have happened to a single individual. Trace fossils preceded “long exposure” photography by hundreds of millions of years. They actually record events in time in high resolution 2D and 3D images and in increments as small as weeks, days, hours, and even minutes and seconds. At their best, they are the equivalent of 3D sculptures of real-time events making them 4-dimensional objects. In contrast to Darwin’s hope that the fossil record would prove to be a record “poorly kept,” one can hardly ask for a more perfect record of anything that happened in the ancient past. Graptolites, mysterious fossils believed to represent animals extinct for the past 350 million years, were recently discovered to be alive in the Indian Ocean adding them to a growing list of ‘living fossils.’


"Just a single species of green algae gave rise to the entire terrestrial plant lineage." ...

"Exactly what this ancestral alga was is still a mystery."


The above is a standard evolutionary false statement of fact followed by a direct admission from the authors that they have no idea what they are talking about. Part 13 is filled with similar quotations not only from textbook authors but from plant specialists demonstrating that they have no idea where plants came from, how they supposedly morphed into each other, or why many so-called “primitive” plants seem to have arrived on the scene after supposedly more “advanced” plants.

“The genome size of these reputed ‘living fossils’ [royal ferns] has remained unchanged ... at least 180 million years.” – Bomfleur B, et al. 2014. Fossilized nuclei and chromosomes reveal 180 million years of genomic stasis in royal ferns. Science 343 (6177): 1376.

Part 14: """Fishes and invertebrates" (Issue 36, July-August 2015)

“The evolution of craniiates [animals with skulls] may be characterized as... profound shifts... new structures without any ancestral counterpart.”

– John G. Maisey; Curator, Vertebrate Paleontology, American Museum of Natural History, N.Y. Discovering Fossil Fishes, p.34

One of the most profound sudden appearances in the ‘vertebrate’ record is that of the placoderm fishes. Among many other ‘firsts’—that happened all at once—they were the first vertebrates with jaws. Not only did they appear out of nowhere as tiny fish but they soon spawned the world’s first super-predator, a 33-foot long, 8,000 lb. monster called Dunkleosteus. It has been determined that the bite of Dunkleosteus equaled 1,100 lbs. of force translating to 8,000 lbs. per square inch at the tip of a fang. How does natural selection turn something that isn’t even the nibble of a minnow into the largest and most powerful biological crushing machine on earth—accompanied by 2-inch thick armor plating—without leaving a trace of the process in the fossil record?

Part 15: Tetrapod evolution credibility questioned via invertebrate fossils (Issue 37, September-October 2015)

“We knew that tetrapods [animals with 4 limbs]...evolved from fish. ...Almost certainly no single scenario can account for all the [hindlimb] stages. ...We may never piece together the entire puzzle of tetrapod evolution.”


Question: How does Dr. Clack—the leading tetrapod authority—go from essentially saying, "We have tetrapod evolution resolved," to "Well, we really don’t have a clue.? Answer: Evolutionary writers become bolder and less accountable the higher up the taxonomic ladder.

Apart from propaganda, modern Darwinists divert away from the lack of evidence for evolution in the fossil record in two primary ways. One of these is to say that the changes are actually genetic. The other is appealing to ‘unknown ancestors.’ The convenient quality of each of these is that they involve things that are invisible. It is my hope that readers will begin to realize there is something amiss in the science community concerning the subject of origins and that research in this area should be just as objective as in any other.

JOHN FELIKS has specialized in the study of early human cognition for 20 years demonstrating that human cognition does not evolve. Earlier, his focus was on the invertebrate fossil record studying fossils in the field across the U.S. and parts of Canada as well as studying many of the classic texts such as the Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology and Index Fossils of North America. Except for a few public domain images, all scans in this article are of fossils recovered by the author direct from formations across the U.S. and Ontario, Canada, over a 30-year span.
Pleistocene underground, Part 1

By Vesna Tenodi MA, archaeology; artist and writer

"The most important conclusion of Dr Poulianos’ research is the co-existence of all main anthropological types—African ... Asian ... European ... at almost the same time period in prehistory."

Caves with evidence of ancient human occupation and underground tunnels are one of those intriguing subjects irresistible to passionate archaeologists. Ranging in size and depth—from shelters a few meters long to multilevel 40-meter deep cities as found in Turkey—these sites include natural underground formations which show evidence of human occupation. In some cases, the natural cave passages have been extended with manmade tunnels, and the cave walls embellished with prehistoric art.

Some European and Asian caves and underground shelters are well known and documented, such as the caves with Paleolithic art in Spain and France, as well as caves with a wealth of archaeological material, that were inhabited by Neanderthals as found in Croatia, Germany and Russia.

Some have remained virtually unknown to the general public for many years. The reasons vary. In Europe and Asia, the reasons for relative obscurity of ancient underground networks were in some cases political, due to oppressive regimes, while in other cases they were of a linguistic nature, or the result of a combination of factors.

Some countries have yet to overcome the language barrier. As long as Hungarian research data are published only in the Hungarian language, German and Austrian research in German, and Greek sites are detailed in Greek—and until someone decides to go to the trouble of translating the material into English—who is to know?

This explains why the Austrian archaeologist, Professor Heinrich Kusch, one of the most passionate people dedicated to ancient cave research, has been working more or less under the radar—globally speaking—for more than four decades.

Dr. Kusch is a prehistorian from the University of Graz in Austria and, together with his geologist/speleologist wife Ingrid, has explored sites all over Europe and Asia for signs of the link between humans and caves (Fig. 1). Prehistoric people mostly used natural caves as shelters. But the Kuschs also found caves that were used for thousands of years for cult worship and ritual purposes, such as the caves they explored in Papua New Guinea, with evidence of burial rites of head-hunting tribes.

While some ancient people worshipped on the top of mountains, others went down deep into the ground to “worship the gods.” Such cults are still alive in some tribal societies (Heinrich and Ingrid Kusch, Sealed Underworld, 2014).

Underground tunnels, in part man-made, at Vorau region of Styria in Austria—are one of the great mystery-thrillers the Kuschs have uncovered. Over the last forty years, the couple explored more than four thousand caves in Europe, Asia, Africa and America, including prehistoric sites for underground cults. They compiled a register of nearly 400 underground places of interest, but what got the world’s attention was the evidence of a network of underground tunnels and megalithic structures. Some of these date back between 10,400 to 14,000 years ago, criss-crossing Europe, in a network stretching from Scotland to Turkey and from Northern Europe down to the Mediterranean Sea. This discovery places the Kuschs among those researchers who are revolutionizing the

> Cont. on page 18
"Some European and Asian caves and underground shelters are well known and documented. ... Some have remained virtually unknown to the general public for many years."

Pleistocene underground (cont.)

Vertesszollos in Hungary, Arago and Terra Amata in France, Happisburgh in Britain, Mauer, Steinheim, and Bilzingsleben in Germany, and a number of equally enigmatic sites in Turkey and Russia. These controversial finds have one thing in common. They all seem to conflict with the popular 'Out of Africa' theory of human origins. That theory is known for belief in a linear 'ape-to-human' evolutionary path. The controversial finds I mention here, on the other hand, are believed to support a totally different popular theory known as the 'Multiregional' theory. In either case, proposed theories, dates, and interpretations of what constitutes different species are across the board.

Petralkona skull—oldest European hominid

The hominid cranium found in 1959 in Petralona cave (Fig. 2 and Fig. 3) in northern Greece is associated with the Middle Pleistocene cave deposits. It provides morphological, metrical and radiographical information on what is commonly thought of as the evolutionary transition from Homo erectus to Homo sapiens (C. Stringer et al. 1979). The significance of the fossil hominid skull from Petralona, Greece. Journal of Archaeological Science 6(3): 235-53. Much like the finds at Denisova cave in Siberia encouraged the naming of another new category and species, Homo georgicus, the Petralona skull also does not fit into any known category and was consequently named Archanthropus europaeus petraoniensis.

The discovery of the Petralona skull was deemed dangerous for its potential to change what is commonly believed about human evolution. The suppression and cover-up which followed read like a real archaeological thriller.

The Petralona human skull was found embedded in the wall of the cave. Later research also uncovered a large number of fossils including proposed "prehuman" species, animal hair, fossilized wood, as well as stone and bone tools. Dr Aris Poulianos is an expert anthropologist who was working at the University of Moscow at the time of the skull discovery. He returned to Greece to take up a position at the University of Athens and to lead the excavation in Petralona cave. He had already published a book, The Origins of the Greeks, with his extensive research showing that Greek people did not originate from the Slavic nations but were indigenous to Greece. Dr Poulianos’ research into the Petralona cave and skull led him into another controversy. The results showed that "Petralona Man" (as the
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skull is known) was 700,000 years old, making him the oldest human europoid (presenting European traits) ever discovered in Europe.

His research suggested to him that Petralona Man evolved separately in Europe and was not an ancestor that came out of Africa.

In 1964, independent German researchers, Breitinger and Sickenberg, tried to dismiss Dr Poulianos’ findings, arguing that the skull was only 50,000 years old and was actually an ancestor that came from Africa. Research published in the US in 1971 in the popular magazine, *Archaeology*, backed up the findings that the skull was indeed 700,000 years old, based on an analysis of the cave’s stratigraphy and the sediment in which the skull was embedded.

Today, most academics who have analyzed the Petralona remains say that the cranium of the *Archaenthropus* of Petralona belongs to an archaic hominid different from both *Homo erectus*, classic Neanderthals, and anatomically modern humans, but showing characteristics of all those species and presenting strong European traits. This skull is either *Homo sapiens* or part *Homo sapiens* and, as such, is in direct conflict with the Out of Africa theory. Dr Poulianos believes it suggests an independent evolution of *Homo sapiens* in Europe.

As mainstream interpretations go, further excavations in the Petralona cave with the participation of 46 international researchers have provided additional support for Dr Poulianos’ position. The body of finds made accurate dating possible and also suggest a continuous presence of stone and bone tool technology in the cave.

The whole picture is being thought of as the *Archaenthropus* evolutionary stage ranging from 750,000–550,000-years old sediment layers within the cave.

**Scientific dating trumped by politically-driven theories**

In 1983, the Greek government ordered that all excavations at the Petralona site must stop and research was forbidden to everybody, including the original archaeological team. The Anthropological Society of Greece took the case to court, and 15 years later Dr Poulianos was again allowed access to the cave.

But not for long.

In 2012, Dr Poulianos and his team of senior archaeologists and geologists were again denied further access to the cave and his research data were suppressed. His findings contradicted conventional views regarding human evolution, so the Greek government just changed the dating to a more comfortable official number of 300,000 years.

In September 2012 Nicholas Mascie-Taylor, Professor of Biological Anthropology at the University of Cambridge, sent a letter to the Ministry of Culture in Greece, on behalf of the European Anthropological Association, saying that the correct date of the skull is 700,000 years and not 300,000 years. He has also challenged the government’s suppression of information regarding this important discovery.

The participants in this saga see this politically-driven suppression of knowledge as yet another proof of fear of the unknown among mainstream scientists. The most important conclusion of Dr Poulianos’ research is the co-existence of all main anthropological types—African (Kobi), Asian (Beijing), and European (Petralona)—at almost the same time period in prehistory (700,000, 500,000 and 750,000 respectively).

These twists and turns in Dr Poulianos work have driven him to continue his research in secret, and places him in today’s growing category of disobedient, “underground archaeologists.”

... To be continued

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)
E-mail: ves@theplanet.net.au

All of Tenodi’s articles published in *Pleistocene Coalition News* can be found at the following link: [http://pleistocenecoalition.com](http://pleistocenecoalition.com)
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.

Prehistory is about to change

The Pleistocene Coalition

PLEISTOCENE COALITION NEWS, Vol. 7: Issue 6 (November-December)
© Copyright 2015

PUBLICATION DETAILS
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF/LAYOUT
John Feliks

COPY EDITORS/PROOFS
Virginia Steen-McIntyre
Tom Baldwin
David Campbell

SPECIALTY EDITORS
James B. Harrod, Rick Dullum, Matt Gatton

ADVISORY BOARD
Virginia Steen-McIntyre

CONTRIBUTORS to this ISSUE
Marilyn Jesmain
Chris Hardaker
Ray Urbaniak
Kevin Lynch
Richard Dullum
Vesna Tenodi
Michael Winkler
Sachin Tiwary
Virginia Steen-McIntyre
John Feliks

Pleistocene Coalition News is produced by the Pleistocene Coalition bi-monthly since October 2009. Back issues can be found near the bottom of the PC home page.

To learn more about early man in the Pleistocene visit our newly redesigned website at pleistocenecoalition.com

The Pleistocene Coalition is now entering its seventh year of challenging mainstream scientific dogma. If you would like to join the coalition please write to the editors.