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The Pleistocene Coalition was initially formed in 2009 for two main reasons:

1.) To bring to public awareness evidence that early peoples were of equal intelligence to modern people—evidence suppressed by the mainstream science community.

2.) To bring to public awareness evidence that early inhabitants of the Americas were present at dates comparable to those of Europe—evidence suppressed by the mainstream science community.

---

There is no mistaking similarity of design between the Arizona 'Flagstaff Stone' discovered by archaeologist, geologist, and professional mining engineer, Dr. Jeffrey Goodman, PhD (last issue: PCN #55, Sept-Oct 2018), and the 16,000-year-old artefact Ray Urbaniak describes this issue. While interpretations are across-the-board as to what such designs might 'mean,' like Tom Baldwin's comparison between H. sapiens and H. erectus engravings (see below), one thing can no longer be doubted; they all show a similar mind at work.

---

Engineer Ray Urbaniak applies his objective skills of U.S. parietal rock art field observation to a recently-published 16,000-year-old 'asterisk' symbol from Saint-Germain-de-la-Rivière, France. He compares it to a similar Native American symbol which appears to serve in observing solstice and equinox joining other possible examples of indigenous science heritage. See Urbaniak p.10.
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Scientific implications of the 500,000-year old Indonesian engraved shell

By Tom Baldwin

"Humanism is not necessarily a safe place to be anymore. It was built atop a three-legged stool that seemed pretty steady some 100 years ago. One leg was Marxism, the second leg, the teachings of Sigmund Freud, and the third leg was Darwin’s Theory of Evolution.”

The idea that human intelligence has evolved and changed over the eons (along with physical variations in our bodies) is a tenet of modern science. To question that idea, to claim early man/woman was as intelligent as you or I, as far as the scientific establishment is concerned, is to be guilty of sacrilege, an abomination, despite the fact that they themselves are, for the most part, irreligious instead calling themselves ‘humanists.’ However, as I have pointed out in the past, modern humanism is not necessarily a safe place to be anymore. It was built atop a three-legged stool that seemed pretty steady some 100 years ago. One leg was Marxism, the second leg, the teachings of Sigmund Freud, and the third leg was Darwin’s Theory of Evolution.

Well, cutting right to the chase, the teachings of both Marx and Freud have fallen into disrepute leaving the modern humanist with a one-legged stool on which to balance. That’s a shaky proposition and has led to dogmatism on their part.

Nothing can be countenanced that will rock the stool because things are already so precarious. If that third leg were to collapse too, it would require a complete rethinking of the human condition.

The problem is there are archaeologists that are working in the field and away from academia, that left their copy of On the Origin of Species behind. They are finally out there getting dirt under their fingernails and are finding things that call evolution into question.

In most cases, that is not and was not the motivation or driving force behind their work. However, that old ‘Law of Unintended Consequences’ does not really care about motives. It just brings things to light that we never expected to see. As a result, the deeper we dig, the more we know, and the better we see that that third leg of humanism is eaten with termites. It is as bad as the other two.

Now, I am going to digress, but bear with me, for we will be returning to that terminal third leg.

When a hunter is out after some animal, it is not unusual for the creature to flee down a hole looking for a place to hide. The hunter, out of frustration or on purpose, may shoot a number of rounds down the hole hoping to hit whatever he was chasing. The bullets, whizzing around can drive the animal crazy with fear and cause it to burst from the hole and make a break for safety and freedom.

Over the last year or so I have written a number of articles for this newsletter that deal with the level of intelligence displayed by early men and women, people that predate modern Homo sapiens. Recently, I have dealt with their seafaring abilities and their jewelry making. I also wrote of markings made by early man, engraved markings that demonstrate an ability to think symbolically. This is a trait those perched on that rotten third leg are reluctant to apply to early man who is supposed to have only recently evolved the ability to think emblematically.

Judging from the Letters to the Editor we are receiving here at PCN our shots have been telling. Our leader, John Feliks, has encouraged me not to give up, and—translated into terms of my metaphor—shoot down the hole a few more times as he senses that we have chased the evolutionists down there and they are at our mercy.

John’s correct. An ability to think symbolically is a game changer. It opens the door to religion. It is the impetus behind art. It has implications for “man, the hunter” as opposed to “man, the scavenger.” In a recent article (PCN #55, Sept-Oct, 2018) I quoted National Geographic where the author, speaking of 75,000-year old engravings from South Africa made by early Homo sapiens states the idea so much better than I:

“These seem rudimentary, but creating a simple shape that stands for something else—a symbol, made by one mind, that can be shared with others… Even more than cave art, these first concrete expressions of consciousness represent a leap from our animal past toward what we are today—a species awash in symbols, from the signs that guide...”
Implications of the 500,000-year old engraved shell (cont.)

"I also wrote of markings made by early man, engraved markings that demonstrate an ability to think symbolically. This is a trait those perched on that rotten third leg are reluctant to apply to early man who is supposed to have only recently evolved the ability to think emblematically."

He was speaking of recent discoveries of markings made some 75,000 to 100,000 years ago by Homo sapiens (Fig. 1). That fits well with evolutionary theory and leaves the sages of evolution turning to each other and nodding in agreement.

But then, here comes the bullet, shot down the hole. It is another, almost identical, set of engravings except that these, found some 6,000 miles away, were not made by modern man, i.e. Homo sapiens. The other set was made by Homo erectus on the island of Java in Indonesia, and they were made some 500,000 years ago (Fig. 2).

In other words, these Homo erectus engravings were made half a million years earlier, eons before there were any Homo sapiens. Evolution does not allow for men living that far in the past to be able to think symbolically. To claim that they could is heresy. It is a bullet buzzing just past the ear of evolutionists hiding down in that hole.

Let us hope this information can panic one or more of those cowering learned sages, into seeing the truth. Or maybe, better yet, the bullet will shatter that already rotten third leg into just so much kindling and force a rethinking of human history. The best rethinking is that which will allow suppressed discoveries to see the light of day.
Three-month old Upper Paleolithic infant buried with honors in a cave 1,000 years after the era of Göbekli Tepe

Dragos Gheorghiu, PhD (experimental archaeologist, artist, pyrotechnics expert, and Professor of cultural anthropology and prehistoric art at National University of Arts, Bucharest, Romania), sent us news of a recent remarkable find. It is the burial of a three-month-old infant dating back to the end of the Upper Paleolithic Era in Italy c. 11,000 years ago. The find was kept secret until dating could be conducted and was announced in July of 2018 (Fig. 1).

The remains include one small hand, a tibia bone, a jawbone (in the process of dissolving), the remnants of teeth, and a small crushed skull.

The find is from an isolated cave site near the small town of Erli between Savona and Cuneo provinces. It is known as Arma Veirana and is only accessible by foot after a half-hour walk. The site is being excavated by Italian, American, Canadian, and German researchers, professors, and students.

Deeper levels in the site date to when its inhabitants were part of the last remaining Neanderthals, approximately 30,000 years earlier than the infant burial, or 42,000–44,000 years ago. Some levels have been dated at more than 50,000 years old.

One of the most remarkable facts of the discovery is that the infant had been buried with a necklace consisting of “precious” perforated shells. And not only were shells present but also the claw from a bird of prey and a similar claw from a carnivore. To put these facts into a broader context, it should be noted that the earlier Neanderthal levels, dating older than 50,000 years, also contain collected objects in the form of quartz artifacts. That the Neanderthals were also fully modern people—for which the ability to create fire would certainly be a sign—the Neanderthal levels also contained abundant remains of food and traces of impressive fire pits or hearths (as per site researcher, Professor Julien Riel-Salvatore, University of Montreal).

An equally remarkable find was what led to discovery of the burial. Right near by was found the tooth of another child who had died at approximately 10 years of age.

The infant burial dates to a time just a thousand years after the now famous 12,000-year-old site of Göbekli Tepe in Turkey (about 2,000 miles east). Göbekli Tepe is covered in several issues of PCN. See especially Gheorghiu’s presentation of its many carved animal figures, Göbekli Tepe: A hunter-gatherer’s architectural world map (PCN #41, May-June 2016).

Being roughly contemporaneous in time, Gheorghiu’s article will give an impression of the high degree of ‘modern’ culture already present by the time of the infant burial. It helps to give readers the perspective that people have always lived and performed social or ritual activities in caves. Unlike the implications of mainstream anthropology there was no “Cave people stage,” i.e., people who were not intelligent enough to create tents or huts but who gradually evolved into ‘tent or hut people.’ The same goes for tent and hut people eventually becoming intelligent enough to live in villages and cities. The shock of Göbekli Tepe’s discovery is that it forever changed the picture of Paleolithic times promoted for the past century—or even since Darwin’s ideas started steering academia. Comparing these two sites in context with each other helps to give the reader more confidence that even though modern, apparently-caring, people were living in and performing rituals in caves remarkable carved stone monuments at Göbekli Tepe arranged like Stonehenge 12,000 years ago were already a part of human culture at the end of the Paleolithic.
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Forbidden Archeology and Virginia Steen-McIntyre

By Michael A. Cremo

My book Forbidden Archeology, first published in 1993, documents archeological evidence for extreme human antiquity. By that I mean human bones, artifacts, and footprints that can reasonably be attributed to anatomically modern humans but which exceed the oldest age normally given for our species (Fig. 1).

Although reports of archeological evidence for extreme human antiquity can be found in the professional scientific literature, they are largely absent from current textbooks, because of what I call a process of knowledge filtration (see e.g., Forbidden Archeology and the Knowledge Filter, PCN #4, March-April 2010). While doing research for Forbidden Archeology in the late 1980s and early 1990s, I found that many of the cases of evidence for extreme human antiquity came from the nineteenth century. Let me give an example.

In 1880, J. D. Whitney, the state geologist of California, published a lengthy review of advanced stone tools found in California gold mines. The implements, including spear points and stone mortars and pestles, were found deep in mine shafts, underneath thick, undisturbed layers of lava, in formations that geologists now say are from the early part of the Eocene (the Eocene goes from 33.9 to 56 million years ago). W. H. Holmes (1899, p. 424), of the Smithsonian Institution, one of the most vocal nineteenth-century critics of the California finds, wrote:

"Perhaps if Professor Whitney had fully appreciated the story of human evolution as it is understood today, he would have hesitated to announce the conclusions formulated [that humans existed in very ancient times in North America], notwithstanding the imposing array of testimony with which he was confronted."

In other words, if the facts do not agree with the favored theory, then such facts, even an imposing array of them, must be discarded.

I wondered if such episodes were confined to the nineteenth century. The case of Virginia Steen-McIntyre provided a twentieth century example of knowledge filtration in archeology.

In 1960s, archeologists uncovered advanced stone tools at Hueyatlaco, Mexico. Virginia Steen-McIntyre and other geologists from the United States obtained an age of about 250,000 years for the site’s implement-bearing layers. This challenged not only standard views of New World anthropology but also the whole standard picture of human origins. At that time, humans capable of making the kind of tools found at Hueyatlaco were not thought to have come into existence until around 100,000 years ago in Africa.

Virginia Steen-McIntyre experienced difficulty in getting her dating study on Hueyatlaco published. Eventually it was published in Quaternary Research (Steen-McIntyre et al. 1981).

"The problem as I see it is much bigger than Hueyatlaco," Virginia wrote in a letter dated March 30, 1981 to Estella Leopold, associate editor of Quaternary Research.

"It concerns the manipulation of scientific thought through the suppression of ‘Enigmatic Data,’ data that challenges the prevailing mode of thinking. Hueyatlaco certainly does that!"

> Cont. on page 6
Forbidden Archeology and Virginia Steen-McIntyre (cont.)

Not being an anthropologist, I didn’t realize the full significance of our dates back in 1973, nor how deeply woven into our thought the current theory of human evolution has become. Our work at Hueyatlaco has been rejected by most archaeologists because it contradicts that theory, period.”

—Virginia Steen-McIntyre

I was pleased to include Virginia’s work in Forbidden Archeology. See Fig. 2 on the following page quoting Virginia during one of my lecture tour slide presentations.

My early contacts with Virginia were through my research assistant, Stephen Bernath. When Forbidden Archeology was published I had him send her a complimentary copy. On October 30, 1993, Virginia wrote to Stephen:

“I’m 4/5’s through Forbidden Archeology and felt led to stop and write you and authors Cremo and Thompson, commending you for a difficult job extremely well done. What an eye-opener! I didn’t realize how many sites and how much data are out there that ‘don’t fit’ modern concepts of human evolution. ...I’m doing my bit getting the publicity out for your book. Have ordered a copy for the local library (wonder how long it will be before it, like critical skeletal material, ‘disappears’?). I’m also sending the book review that appeared in Sept./Oct. Science Frontiers Book Supplement to various friends and colleagues (almost 50 so far). I predict the book will become an underground classic.”

I wrote to Virginia on December 30, 1993:

“Thank you for your letter about Forbidden Archeology. It does seem to be on its way to becoming an underground classic. William Corliss [editor of Science Frontiers Book Supplement] says it is selling well, and it is going out through other outlets to people interested in these things. Some standard academics in the fields of the history and sociology of science also seem to be taking it seriously. I am not going to mention any names, but one history of science scholar told me he is going to review it for a journal in his field and a major anthropology journal editor also wrote to me saying he was going to review it. I am very cautious about revealing any names at this point because of the danger of attempts to suppress the reviews if the word gets out prematurely.”

I also added,

“George Carter has been writing to us about Forbidden Archeology. He had this to say about Hueyatlaco: ‘I am convinced that there is very old material there but it is not the bifacially flaked knives. The geomorphology is very tricky, and it seems to me that an erosion occurred that they missed in the field and that infilling put more advanced material at a lower level.’ George seems to have some resistance to having advanced implements at the 200,000 to 300,000 year level, but is prepared to find very crude implements at such levels. ...I wrote him back that if someone has such an idea, then they can always propose that the geology at a site has been misread. But I said that in the absence of any clear evidence that the geology has indeed been misread, then we should be prepared to adjust our idea of what the actual lithic series in America or anywhere else might be. So—just for the record—what do you have to say about the suggestion that you all might have missed an erosion and infilling at Hueyatlaco? I can imagine what your answer will be, but I would still like to have it in your own words. ...Finally, I recently got a nasty note from Richard Leakey, who says Forbidden Archeology is pure humbug and that only fools would take it seriously. What an endorsement!”

Virginia replied to me January 18, 1994:

“Had to smile at George Carter’s comment about the age of the bifacial tools at Hueyatlaco. Seems to me he’s falling into the same pattern as his own critics. Why can’t we just look at the data (closely, critically) then go on from there? What I had hoped to do is find a field sketch the late Cynthia sent to Hal Malde way back in the early 60’s. It showed the artifact-bearing beds as she mapped them. The stratigraphy of the beds is simple: the complexity comes in with the overlying, younger beds. We noted the same relationship in ’73, once the trenches were cleared of water hyacinth. (The trenches were flooded by the Valsequillo Reservoir during the wet season.) The beds in the lower reaches were very durable, almost like adobe. Even after standing abandoned for 9 years, we could still see the lines marking Cynthia’s stratigraphic units traced on the trench walls. When she was still speaking to me, she commented...”

> Cont. on page 7
"I'm 4/5's through *Forbidden Archeology* and felt led to stop and write you and authors Cremo and Thompson, commend ing you for a difficult job extremely well done. What an eye-opener! ... I predict the book will become an underground classic."

—Virginia Steen-McIntyre

The point is that a recent infilling was not likely to be so consolidated.

Virginia added:

"Last month I 'inherited' a ton of Hueyat lace sediment samples and, most important, stratigraphic monoliths. Stratigraphic monoliths are stabilized columns of sediment taken directly from the trench walls. If they haven't been tampered with (they were crated and stored down in Mexico for several years), they represent the stratigraphy as it actually occurred at the site in 1973. There is the added possibility that I might recover an actual artifact from these monoliths if and when I work them up, especially the big one, weighing 500 lbs. or more, that Fryxell and I took from the artifact-bearing layers in the lower trench."

Virginia concluded her letter,

"Any fellow who is snubbed by Richard Leakey is a friend of mine!"

I feel fortunate to be included among her friends.

---
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**Forbidden Archeology and Virginia Steen-McIntyre (cont.)**

on the hardness of the sediment, even the layers that held the bifacial tools. As I recall, she said they had to remove the artifacts using chisels: no brush and trowel work here!"

Heston. Among many other films and programs Cremo has been a regular contributor and guest on the *Ancient Aliens* television series where he presents anomalous and suppressed evidence from the archaeological recordchal-

---

**Fig. 2.** Citing Virginia during one of my *Forbidden Archeology* lecture tour presentations. The 1981 date shows Virginia saw the problem early on. The suppression of the USGS team’s multi-dating-method results shows how knowledge filtration works in science.

---

**Websites:**

www.mcremo.com

www.forbiddenarcheologist.com
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**Michael A. Cremo** is a long-time researcher, author, and lecturer on the topic of human antiquity and the history of archaeology. He is best known for his comprehensive volume, *Forbidden Archeology*, which he co-authored along with the late Dr. Richard Thompson, as well as for the controversial television special, *The Mysterious Origins of Man*, hosted by Charlton...
Following the science wherever it might lead

By Richard Dullum

When the Pleistocene Coalition took me on as a researcher and writer, one of my goals was to expose modern-day Western archaeology documenting only evidence supporting the Darwinian theory of human evolution instead of following the science wherever it might lead.

Objectively following the science requires that we thoroughly analyze ALL evidence regarding the human experience here on Earth.

Since academia has seen the publication of Forbidden Archeology by Michael Cremo and Richard Thompson—which documents the history of archaeology—we have found evidence that does not fit and, in fact, regularly contradicts the Darwinian ‘ape-to-man’ paradigm. Much evidence that has been published in the secondary scientific literature (e.g., professional journals, conference proceedings, minutes of professional societies, etc.) has often caused controversies that lasted many years. These controversies have involved, and still involve, very important evidence.

The problem is not due to the fact that the evidence is controversial but that none of this evidence has been made available to students seeking degrees in archaeology, anthropology, or paleontology. This is still the case today. For example, while a single finger bone found in a Russian cave was enough evidence for mainstream academia to announce discovery of the ‘Denisovan humans,’ several modern human finger-bones and footprints from modern humans found nearby were not enough to make academia admit even the possibility that modern humans may have existed in the 1.42–3.5-million year old Early Pleistocene in Africa. See also 1.84 million-year old “modern human” bone being promoted as “not” H. sapiens (PCN #42, July-August 2016).

Because of the theoretical expectations of their time and paradigm, the researchers who found these ‘modern’ bones and footprints have been obligated to attribute them to Homo erectus even though no hand or foot skeletons for Homo erectus have ever been found for comparison.

Mainstream archaeologists when faced with problematic discoveries by credible scientists and other researchers—whose credentials are just as well established and whose research methods are just as sound if not more sound than theirs—continue to deny, suppress, ridicule, defame and bury any evidence which casts doubt on their carefully constructed human evolutionary theory.

We at the PC have chosen to look closely at evidence in the Pleistocene era, roughly between 2 million and 11,000 years ago. This covers the time period in which modern man is said to have evolved. That is the period we concentrate on because it’s here that the most contentious scientific debates have taken place over how human beings came to be.

Darwinian descent of man posits that humans came about by ‘splitting off’ from the chimpanzee line. By slow, successive serial modifications they are said to have morphed into the creature we call man today. This is claimed to have taken place during a period from about 5 million to 10 million years ago. This thoroughly disproved ‘Lamarckian’ idea still persists, namely, that characteristics acquired in the lifetime of an organism are passed onto their offspring. This idea was proposed before the mechanisms behind biological changes were understood at all.

The monkey-to-man scenario was accepted in the era when renowned scientists such as Thomas Huxley actually regarded the cell—now known to be an extremely complex unit—as a “glob of goo.” It was also during a time when scientists pointed to the appearance of Australian Aborigines and other “primitives” as evidence that man had evolved from lowly forms to the highest form, the European, with his highbrow and superior intellect. That such an idea was perfectly in line with the current state of human affairs in colonial-era Europe should not be surprising, given that racism and slavery were still abiding cultural norms at the time.

The chauvinism of the European mindset in those days still has its talons.

>A Cont. on page 9
The late Hal Malde, Hueyatlaco expert, brief introduction

"The late Harold ‘Hal’ Malde, [was a] USGS geologist, prolific research author, and pioneer of ‘repeat photography.’"

The scientific communities of Europe and America joyously set about investigating the earth to prove it. It is clear to a dispassionate observer that all evidence contradicting recently evolved man, such as encountered in the monumental Forbidden Archeology, was never properly evaluated. It was set aside only because of its conflict with the developing human evolution picture. The foregoing should outline the genesis of modern evolutionary thought as it developed from Darwin’s ideas and much selective editing. Archaeology promotes Darwinism as true, then sets about finding evidence to prove it. If Darwinism is true then why dig to prove it?

RICHARD DULLUM, a surgical R.N. working in a large O.R. for the past 30 years retired this July though remains a researcher in early human prehistory and culture. He is also a Vietnam veteran with a degree in biology. In addition to his work with Kevin Lynch, he has written ten prior articles for PCN and is also a PCN copy editor. All of Dullum and Lynch’s articles in PCN can be found at the following link:

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

Below are a few quick excerpts from Memorial to Harold Edwin Malde by Warren B. Hamilton, with scientific details assisted by Malde’s friend and colleague, Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre.

Harold E. “Hal” Malde, 1923-2007, was a distinguished U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Quaternary geologist. At university he majored in mathematics and chemistry. While at Harvard, contact with a geology professor had great impact and Malde switched his major to geology. He was hired full time by the USGS in 1951. Malde was a major contributor to comprehensive advisory studies published by the NAS and was on many influential committees including the Department of the Interior.

From 1964-2004 Malde, along with other experts from the USGS was involved in the dating of volcanically-derived strata at Hueyatlaco site in Mexico that included well-crafted bifacial stone implements. The story of Hal Malde to be continued. –jf
Asterisk sign c. 16,000 BP and solstice markers

By Ray Urbaniak Engineer, rock art researcher and preservationist

Archaeologist Genevieve von Petzinger published an excellent book in 2016 which is primarily on Western European Ice Age rock art signs. It is called, *The First Signs: Unlocking the Mysteries of the World’s Oldest Symbols*. The symbol that shocked me the most in von Petzinger’s book is what she referred to as an asterisk which had been engraved on a deer tooth.

The asterisk is one of the signs von Petzinger later refers to as an AMS or artificial memory system. To me it is just that, it is what I refer to as a ‘double-ended bird-foot.’ In Southwest U.S. parietal rock art they point to the sunrise and sunset positions for the solstices and equinoxes. I was shocked to see that they may have used it as far back as 16,000 years ago in Saint-Germain-de-la-Rivière, France (Fig. 1).

However, after studying collections posted on several different websites such as the French site, Abris on these bird-foot solstice and equinox pointers titled *Equinox Sunrise & Sunset Horizon Markers*. It was published on the Manataka website. The article is undated but can be found here: manataka.org/page2673.html.

The incised tooth that had only this double-ended bird foot symbol and no other marks looks quite similar to the pointer for the solstices and equinoxes, sunrise and sunset pointers (Fig. 2). I once wrote an article going into additional details on how the people of Saint-Germain-de-la-Rivièremost people of France very likely did track the solstice and equinox positions.

The people of Saint-Germain-de-la-Riviéremost people of France very likely did track the solstice and equinox positions. I once wrote an article going into additional details that the people of Saint-Germain-de-la-Rivièremost people of France very likely did track the solstice and equinox positions.

The symbol that shocked me the most in von Petzinger’s book is what she referred to as an asterisk which had been engraved on a deer tooth.

The asterisk is one of the signs von Petzinger later refers to as an AMS or artificial memory system. To me it is just that, it is what I refer to as a ‘double-ended bird-foot.’ In Southwest U.S. parietal rock art they point to the sunrise and sunset positions for the solstices and equinoxes. I was shocked to see that they may have used it as far back as 16,000 years ago in Saint-Germain-de-la-Rivière, France (Fig. 1).

However, after studying collections posted on several different websites such as the French site, Abris

Fig. 1. A 16,000-year old asterisk symbol etched on a deer tooth from Saint-Germain-de-la-Rivière, France. Photo: D. von Petzinger.

Fig. 2. Left: Comparing detail of the 16,000-year old Saint-Germain-de-la-Rivière asterisk symbol—photo by D. von Petzinger [cropped and sharpened in layout]—with, Right: the ‘double-ended bird foot’ motif for measuring solstices & equinoxes laid down horizontally.

> Cont. on page 11
Asterisk sign c. 16,000 BP and solstice markers (cont.)

"I have seen these double-ended pointers incised as parietal rock art. The angle on this tooth is approx. 80 degrees while the actual angle for Dordogne is 68.7 degrees. Therefore, the motif could have been symbolic of actual pointers in the area but not actually used as a pointer. Fig. 3 shows a geoglyph marker I made at my home many years ago. I eventually, redesigned it using stones and including a longer center for easier viewing (Fig. 4). The photo of this marker shows the bird-foot pattern pointing at the equinox sunset. One portable shortcut I’ve speculated about regarding the bird-foot solstice-equinox markers in this region of the American Southwest (dating of much parietal rock art is not an easy task with so many variables involved) is that the Anasazi may have formed a bird hand to roughly determine the solstice and equinox horizon positions. The whole idea is that if you know one of the positions with any certainty you can easily estimate the other two (Fig. 5).

In light of the evidence presented in this article, especially Figs. 1–2, I suggest it would be worthwhile for field archaeologists to check for any surviving bird-foot or other forms of solstice or equinox parietal rock art horizon point markers near habitation sites in the Dordogne region of France. This is where the necklace grave site was located which contained the motif shown in Figs. 1–2. Even after the passing of all these millennia, the pointers, if found and if indeed meant to be pointers, could be confidently identified for they would remain today less than two degrees off.
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Experimental archaeology and Paleolithic-style hand stencils

By Ray Urbaniak Engineer, rock art researcher and preservationist

Perhaps the most iconic image recognizable by nearly everyone as Paleolithic art is the negative hand stencil (Fig. 1) On page 122 of Genevieve von Petzinger’s interesting 2016 book, The First Signs: Unlocking the Mysteries of the World’s Oldest Symbols—which is primarily about Western European Ice Age rock art signs—she talks about “spit-painting.” Even though I, and likely all of our readers, are pretty familiar with the basic concept, this time, the subject particularly caught my interest. It encouraged me to research further and also to do some of my own hand stencil experimentation.

First, let me cite some excerpts from von Petzinger’s traditional overview on the subject of hand stencils:

“There are two ways to do this: the first is to put crushed charcoal or ochre in your mouth, add a bit of water to liquefy it, swish it around to mix the powder in, and then spit it back out in a controlled manner to coat the wall evenly, either directly from the mouth or through some sort of strawlike implement, such as a bird bone or reed. … this is not as easy as it sounds! Spit-painting is more commonly used to make negative hand stencils. These are created by placing your flat hand on the rock surface and then spitting paint all over and around it. When you lift it up, you are left with an outline, which is why they are called ‘negative’ hands.

Von Petzinger goes on to explain that the second way to spit-paint might seem more like a paint—blowing method:

“In this case you put the ochre or charcoal powder in the palm of your hand and blow it straight onto the wall.”

She explains that similar to spit-painting, you can do this either just with your breath or by using some kind of a straw to help direct the spray of powder.

Finally, von Petzinger explains how the paint actually adheres:

“Since the walls in many caves are damp, even dry powder will stick and start to liquefy once it makes contact. Blowing the powder tends to produce slightly clumper results, but it also means you can avoid putting the pigment directly in your mouth.”

This sounded in line with what I already understood to be the basic techniques. However, after thinking about it for a while none of these methods, especially the spit method, sounded appealing. I wondered, might anyone have proposed that some of these ancient people could have used any other methods?

Fig. 1. Hand stencils in Pettakere Cave, on the Indonesian island of Sulawesi. They were Uranium—Thorium dated in 2014 to a minimum of 39,900 years old. Image: Wikimedia Commons.
solution I had in mind. He said, “What if we do it like this,” and proceeded to offer a solution that was so simple I was amazed and I have remembered to look for the simple solution ever since.

In light of looking for a simpler solution, I believe that at least some of the ancient artists most likely came to the same conclusion. I am certain that some Paleolithic artists did, indeed, use the other methods such as spit-painting from the mouth which is still practiced in Australia but I think this pigment dusting transfer method could have been the preferred method.

According to this technique, the Paleolithic artists would have put a small amount of water in their mouths, mixed it with their saliva, then violently atomize it over their hand on the wall with a strong puff of air. This would have been repeated several times until they created the equivalent of a damp cave wall around their hand. Since they didn’t have cotton cloth or cotton balls they would likely have used a piece of fur working pigment evenly into the fur. Then, they would simply dust it over their hand and the pigment would be dissolved by the areas of the wall that were damp.

Fig. 2 above is a negative hand stencil I created using this water-spitting and dusting method. Since this was my second try, I am certain that the results would quickly improve after I had perfected the technique. It took me two tries to do this because it was difficult for me to hold my old bony hands tight against the surface of this uneven rock face. I used a few small cotton balls since that was all I had available. However, I am certain a piece of fur would work much better. A smooth rock surface with a fatter hand would also greatly improve the results. von Petzinger says that hand stencils may have just been made to show that the people were there either as individuals or as a group. She also suggests that hand stencils may have been used as an early “sign language.” My own belief is a little more on the spiritual side that it was primarily because the artists were well aware of the impermanence in the world and that hand stencils was something that would outlive them and could give them a form of immortality.

Finally, in addition to European caves, negative hand prints are primarily found in Africa, Australia, Borneo and Indonesia, as well as Argentina, and the Southwest USA. The Indonesian handprints shown in Fig. 1 have been dated to a minimum of 39,900 years old, or, rounding off, at the least they are 40,000 years old.

It is also very interesting to note that according to von Petzinger, on page 167 of her book, she states:

“There is a definite trend of the hands being discontinued over time, and they vanished completely in Western Europe at the very latest by 13,000 years ago.”

Perhaps this is linked to changes in the beliefs of Paleolithic people worldwide.
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The myth of millennial migrations

By John Feliks

One of the most well-known science claims is that it took early peoples such as Homo erectus, Neanderthals, and Homo sapiens hundreds of thousands of years to spread around the world. The idea is so engrained in modern popular culture that it is treated as an axiom, i.e., as an idea regarded so obvious that evidence is not even necessary in order to accept it as true. However, when testing such claims against known real-time facts of how long it actually takes people to cover great distances, including whole continents on foot, a totally different picture emerges. Population sizes aside for the time-being it suggests that the feat of colonizing the world could have been accomplished in a matter of years or decades (Fig. 1).

This possibility needs to be looked at in depth because if true it suggests major scientific miscalculation due to mainstream ideology. Exploring such a possibility objectively is what science is all about. Beliefs about Paleolithic migrations are very important because they impact what people believe about human prehistory in general which, in turn, affects what they believe about the more important subject of human origins. In a modern world where science is trying to claim increasing authority its accountability to the people it influences must be increased as well. As Richard Dullum suggests in this issue, everyone has a right to know about all of the facts and not just selected facts chosen by a few in academia. This is so people can make up their own minds based on all of the evidence available.

The three examples in Fig. 1 were selected from among hundreds of fully-documented cases in international news (including filmed) of modern people who have crossed continents—north, south, east and west—and even the entire world on foot. As it turns out, continents are crossed in a matter of months or years, not centuries, and certainly not in a matter of millennia as the public has long been taught to believe regarding early human migrations.

Further, scientific studies show that early peoples were much stronger and more mobile than modern people (e.g., see The straight line route: A different perspective on trekking from Central Asia to the U.S. Southwest, PCN #23, May-June 2013). The studies reinforce the idea that early people would have been capable of colonizing the entire Paleolithic world in less than a hundred years.

The Pleistocene Coalition was formed in 2009 to bring to the public scientific evidence suppressed by mainstream academia. Evidence which continues to be held back because of dogma could affect what people believe about prehistory were they able to know about it. The evidence involves modern-level intelligence in early Paleolithic peoples and evidence of their unexpectedly early presence in the Americas.
Aboriginal Paleolithic artifacts explained

By Vesna Tenodi, MA archaeology; artist, writer, and former 25-year employee of the Australian Government

Myths and misconceptions—trumped by material evidence

At the end of every year I carry out my personal ritual of looking back and looking forward. Summing up the current year and planning for the next year, I think of people and causes that are important to me. People who matter the most are those who inspire me, both personally and professionally, and who lead or have lived exemplary lives. Those who have that unique combination of qualities—true intelligence, integrity of character, belief in the cause they chose to fight for, and an unwavering faith in what they do. And the tenacity to pursue their ideals.

There are quite a few of such inspirational people I was lucky to either get to know personally or to learn about from their work. I admire them all, but am using this opportunity to mention just two—Virginia Steen-McIntyre... Daisy May Bates.”

In contrast to Galileo—who was forced to recant his claims that the Earth moves around the immovable Sun—Virginia Steen-McIntyre decided not to budge and has been fighting her battle against the political and academic establishment for 50 years. Still going strong, and as brilliant as ever, she does not need me to fight her cause.

From glorified humanitarian to worst enemy

At the other end of the world, in Australia, a similar travesty has been committed against Daisy Bates, 1859–1951 (PCN #27, Jan-Feb, 2014). She lived with Aboriginal tribes for 35 years, and dedicated her life to their well-being. The tribes loved her and called her the Grandmother. She was also greatly admired by her contemporaries, receiving accolades for her humanitarian work and compassion for people that few were interested in at that time.

With a change of the political regime and the rise of the omnipotent Aboriginal industry, Daisy Bates fell into disgrace. Her books, notes and journals, for which she was admired and honored, were declared to be “offensive.” For telling the ugly truth, she was labeled a “racist,” and her work is today all but forgotten.

Her books, once viewed as the best and most accurate record of Aboriginal Paleolithic culture, as well as her detailed descriptions of their Paleolithic daily life, customs and worldview—now form part of the Australian forbidden past.

The Aboriginal industry has a list of pet words and slogans which have proved to be quite effective in destroying anyone who is ideologically opposed to them. Much like the dis-
Aboriginal Paleolithic artifacts explained (cont.)

"What I do find upsetting and repulsive, is the Aboriginal industry aggressively lying about the past. They now deny what has been recorded by a number of researchers over almost two hundred years."

Massive, “that’s essentially impossible,” phrase in Virginia’s case, labeling someone a “racist” or describing them as being “disrespectful” to Aborigines is an equally effective way to shut them up, destroy their career, incite public hate, and to even put their lives in danger.

Sex and Drugs and the Unlovable Thugs

While thinking about the horrible impact that the political correctness had on Australian art and archaeology, I re-read Daisy Bates’ books and notes, including some of her hidden records that were made available to me. She was accepted by the tribes and made privy even to men’s “secret sacred business” such as initiations—to which Aboriginal women were never allowed access (Daisy Bates, The Passing of the Aborigines, 1938). From her notes we also learn details about Aboriginal sex life, in daily living as well as during various initiation ceremonies she had witnessed.

She describes some of these ceremonies as “orgies of rampant sex” and others as “brutality of genital mutilation which they could not explain the origin of, but conducted them anyway.” Ancient rock art, depicting Aboriginal view of sexuality, confirms that.

Bates described promiscuous sex as common to all the tribes, especially during major gatherings, ceremonies and initiations. During such events, plants were brewed and drunk, naked male and female participants would keep dancing and chanting until they brought themselves into a frenzy, and carried out sexual acts with whoever was nearby. She explains those practices were the reason why Aborigines identified only with the place their mother was from and regarded only her tribe as their own.

Bates described the gruesome phenomenon of cannibalism and claimed that “all the natives in the area are cannibals.” She was attacked and counterclaimed were made that “cannibalism among Aborigines is unknown.” She returned the attack with an article in the Adelaide Register, under the heading “Aboriginal Cannibals: Mothers Who Eat Their Babies.” After that defiant, provocative article, another attack followed. To which Bates once again had her response, published in the West Australian, saying: “I would like your readers to know that the circumcised tribes from the Kimberley (North-West of Australia) to the South Coast are all active cannibals.”

Her attitude was that all customs, regardless of how gruesome, must be recorded. So she described the ghastly initiation ceremonies, going on for weeks. In order to be transformed from a child into a man, every boy had to endure nine sets of initiation rites.

She described those rituals, from nose piercing and tooth ablation, to genital mutilation, human blood drinking, and repeated rape perpetrated during the initiation rites. She gained insight into these aspects of tribal life because, as she said, “a blackfellow would talk about his genitals with the same freedom as he would talk about an ear, a foot, or a finger.” She described the rite of sub-incision, when a cut was made on an erect penis, to “make it spread” (These customs are also mentioned in the book by Elizabeth Salter: Daisy Bates—The Great White Queen of the Never Never, 1971).

Having read about brutal practices in Aboriginal and other prehistoric cultures, I don’t find any of that overly disturbing in itself. I try to stay unemotional, and accept such information as a matter of fact. Mankind has always been cruel and brutal to some degree, only the methods of cruelty change. But what I do find upsetting and repulsive, is the Aboriginal industry aggressively lying about the past. They now deny what has been recorded by a number of researchers over almost two hundred years. They now deny what a number of our contemporary researchers—some of whom I have spoken with—witnessed as recently as the late 1960s and early 1970s, confirming data as collected by Daisy Bates, only to have such information edited out of their Government-commissioned reports. In a similar manner, all “offensive” archaeological material, including fossilized prehistoric skulls and bones, has been removed from museum displays. If Australians wish to view these, they have to go to museums abroad.

Lying and denying as a way of re-writing history

There are a number of penis-shaped stones in an archaeological collection entrusted to me. My Aboriginal informants claim that such stones were traditionally used as a sex aid, or sex toy, to facilitate pleasure. Daisy mentioned such stones as being sexual tools, used for both “pleasure” and “punishment.” During initiation ceremonies, these stones were used to teach the young men certain lessons, especially in taking pain.

I was curious to find out how the Aboriginal industry interprets these penis-shaped objects today. And that cheered me up. I couldn’t stop laughing.

Sacred clyicons... or just dildos?

Clyicons are cylindro-conical stones, often marked with lateral lines and grooves, such as circular or semi-circular parallel lines in vertical rows converging at the

> Cont. on page 17
Aboriginal Paleolithic artifacts explained (cont.)

“All ‘offensive’ archaeological material, including fos-
tiles, describes these cylindro-conical stones in a num-er of ways, such as:
• ceremonial artifacts
• mystery stones
• objects of totemic significance
• mystical power-rocks
• objects of great ceremonial importance
• mysterious implements
• the earliest art of the Aborigines

Fig. 1. CYLICON (YURDA); c. 22,000–5,000 years old; Called “magico-
religious” talismans with marks speculated to record the “number of young men to pass the initiation rituals to manhood.”

With knowledge of Aboriginal culture and practices identification as dildos may be just as valid. New South Wales. Schoyen Collection, MS 5087/37.

Fig. 2. Another sample CYLICON 22,000–5,000 BP, New South Wales. Schoyen Collection, MS 5087/15.

and bones, has been removed from museum displays.”

Sexual violence is taboo as well. The customary rape of children has been reported for years, but judges let the perpetrators go free, because child rape is explained as part of “their culture” and “sacred custom,” i.e., a culture in which violence is a way of life. A Central Australian prosecutor described the problem:

“Aboriginal children, including babies as young as seven months, are being raped by community members, with the crimes going largely unreported and with few cases making it to trial.”

Nanette Rogers, Central Australia’s Crown Prosecutor, has written a dossier on the “tragic state of domestic violence in Aboriginal communities” which details horrific acts of abuse.

I see a clear connection between “sacred rites” with the use of cylcons and Aboriginal sexual violence today. Any psychologist will say that a child terrorized in a series of rape-including rites is bound to become an angry man who in turn is likely to torture children the way he was tortured himself. Who wouldn’t be traumatized after having a cylcon rammed repeatedly into their orifices, by way of a teaching practice.

The tradition of tribal obsession with sex is also depicted in ancient rock art with crude images of vaginas and penises covering rock shelters.

I find the subject interesting from both an archaeological as well as an artistic aspect.

The Aboriginal industry has a bizarre approach to such “sensitive” matters. It seems, according to them, “If it looks like a duck and walks like a duck, it must be … an elephant.”

So I feel compelled to here announce that these “mysterious objects” and Paleolithic dildos. And the Aboriginal industry should give a medal for solving this tricky problem, which has mystified them for decades!
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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.