Controversial ceramic figurine
Rockey Whipkey

New "suppressed evidence" DVDs
Bill Cote

Kudos for PCN
From our readers

American Genesis ahead of the game
David Campbell and Jeff Goodman

Reassessing 'Evo-Devo' and selection theory
Jörn Greve and Gerhard Neuhäuser

Bilzingsleben series, Prt. 8: Homo erectus engravings in 3D
John Feliks

International Wanjin & Bradshaw
Vesna Tenodi

How to give an audio/visual presentation
Virginia Steen-McIntyre

Inside

- Challenging the tenets of mainstream scientific agendas -

Unexplored territory
Mainstream education in anthropology, biology, paleontology trains students to think entirely in evolutionary terms. The result is that when students go into professional life they are automatic defenders of an ideology. Evidence that conflicts with ideas they were led to believe were unassailable is rejected without critical thought in fields such as evolutionary biology or evolutionary psychology and is faced with the knee-jerk reaction of suppression while keeping those who perform the censorship out of public sight. If reactions like this evidence of early people in the Americas or modern-level intelligence in early peoples make you question the strength of scientific claims, or if you can simply no longer accept a science community teaching ideology as fact, then join us in our exploration of new territories! If you begin to look at the evidence objectively you may find that the challenge of antiquity is more fascinating than you imagined. We hope you enjoy our 19th issue of Pleistocene Coalition News.

How deep do we dig? The pros and cons of a controversial ceramic figurine

By Rockey Whipkey

What are the odds of digging or drilling a hole in the ground and finding something of ancient origin? I have always thought that they would be quite high, but from the stories of the recent past we can see the odds are quite low when compared to finding lost treasure such as buried cash hordes or jewels.

Miners, well diggers, amateur rock hunters, even local children have regularly found artifacts of surprising sophistication. Just rummaging the surface for rarities, even materials thrust out from mining activities have long brought obscure items including human fossil remains and even buildings to the eyes of the general public.

When these ancient artifacts are found, they immediately become objects of ridicule for those that have discovered them. Very soon they are denounced by the scientific community, and then left in the dust, driven down the lonely road to obscurity.

The Nampa Image

The Nampa figurine (Fig. 1), a small female figure made from fired clay, about 1½ inches in size, was found in Nampa, Idaho in July of 1889, by Mark A. Kurtz, a respected local businessman. Kurtz and his business partners were drilling for water. The object was found at a depth of 320 feet. While drilling the well and simultaneously lining the bore hole with encasing pipe, the drill pump brought the Nampa figurine to the surface via steam driven suction from deep sands under an ancient lava flow laid down during the late Tertiary or possibly the early Quaternary period. Thus the figurine has been dated to the early Pleistocene age about 2 million years ago.

Fig. 1. The Nampa figurine, a small fired clay female figure about 1½ inches tall (3.81cm) found in Nampa, Idaho, in 1889.

Some challenges inside:

- Homo erectus engravings in 3D
- International "Wanjin" Solution in reverse
- Reassessing "Evo-Devo"
- Giving an audio/visual presentation

[Ed. Note: In 2009, the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS) pushed the beginnings of the Pleistocene nearly 800,000 years' further back in time to c. 2.6 million years ago. The effect on anthropology is that many remains and artifacts once referred to as "Plioocene" (older than c. 1.8 million years) now fall conveniently within the Pleistocene age. While not referring particularly to the Nampa image, repercussions will likely include mainstream thinkers becoming more objective regarding controversial evidence from this early age].

The Facts

The original geological settings from the drill site were recorded > Cont. on page 2
How deep do we dig? (cont.)

and published by a geologist at the time. Below is the data from a U.S. Geological Survey atlas within the 1904 publication of the Nampa well drilling. It is from the section titled, “A well bored at Nampa (elevation, 2490 feet) gave the following section (see Table 1).”

He continues, “Thus there is in this well, below the 60 feet of Quaternary material, 15 feet of basalt and 220 feet of sands with some clays. The latter probably represent the Idaho formation [Quaternary/Tertiary]. Near the bottom, at an elevation of 2170 feet, was a layer of lignitic material. Finally, below this came a harder sandstone, which may represent the Payette formation [Tertiary].”

The Nampa figurine was a well fired piece containing clay, quartz, and traces of iron oxide. The oxidation is reported to have been promoted by the surrounding materials at a level of 320 feet below the surface.

After showing the figurine to Professor F.W. Putnam (known as the ‘Father of American Archaeology’) of Harvard University, G.F. Wright noted that “he at once directed attention to the character of the incrustations of iron upon the surface as indicative of a relic of considerable antiquity. There were patches of anhydrous red oxide of iron in protected places upon it, such as could not have been formed upon any fraudulent object.”

An important fact of the Nampa figurine is that it is a fired clay image. The oldest recorded fired clay items date to 6,000–10,000 years ago. The Nampa figure is not included in this record.

After doing an image search on the Internet for any North American clay figures, Was the Nampa Image a Hoax?

Although there is the possibility that these professional businessmen were attempting to perpetrate a hoax, the scientific research done at that time seems to provide adequate proof that the fig-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of well at Nampa, Idaho</th>
<th>Depth in feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At top, hardpan and loam</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt, below which roots, leaves, and vegetable mold are found</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowlders [sic] and sand clay seam</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sand clay seam</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sand</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sand</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sand</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Table from page 2 of Geologic Atlas of the United States, 1904—Nampa Folio, No. 103, USGS—indicating the layer from which the Nampa figure was recovered. The text in folio leading up to the table reads: “A well bored at Nampa (elevation, 2490 feet) gave the following section.”

> Cont. on page 3
"Although there is the possibility that these professional business-men were at-

tempting to perpetrate a hoax, the scientific research done at that time seems

to provide adequate proof that the figure was not placed in the well and is of real antiquity."
Announcements

New DVDs available

Valsequillo: An Archaeological Enigma

New Evidence of Early Man: SUPPRESSED

In the months ahead

Pleistocene Coalition Art Gallery

News from Bill Cote:
If not yet available online, those interested can order copies of the recently-completed and new Payn/Cote Valsequillo DVDs by phone, mail, or e-mail.

Valsequillo: An Archaeological Enigma
Length: 2 hours 20 minutes including the director's new 30-minute final section
Format: DVD
Description: This is what we call the 'Academic Version.' It tells the story with more emphasis on the science and more detail given to the tests and scientific explanations and arguments.
Price: $20 US plus $5 S+H

New Evidence of Early Man: SUPPRESSED
Length: 84 minutes*
Format: DVD
Description: This is what we call the 'Broadcast Version.' It simplifies the science and tells the story in a way best suited for the non-scientific viewer. It's a bit more sensational than the Academic Version and includes a bonus disc (disc2).
Price: $25 US plus $5 S+H
To order by mail: Send a check for $25-$30 made out to BC Video mentioning which DVD you would like and where to send it.
BC Video
152 West 25th Street
New York, NY 10001

PCN: Kudos from our readers over the past 3 years

"There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."
-Machiavelli 1513

"This is exactly the sort of thing that starts an academic revolution and attacks the suppression of knowledge. High marks to PC!"

"Thank you very much for your very impressive Pleistocene Coalition News."

"What great news! Keep it going/coming guys!"

"Very impressive newsletter."

"I must commend you and the other editors for one of the finest Journals that tells it like it is found in nature."

"Fascinating website and newsletter."

"These are very important documents."

"An excellent edition of the PC read from cover to cover. I really don't know how you do it, but the articles that keep coming are fresh, thought-provoking and, in some cases, brilliant."

"Your newsletter material is better than GSA Today."

"Quite a wonderful and needed cause you've undertaken."

"A most interesting and fascinating piece of work. Thank you and your coworkers very much for all the effort you again had to put into this publication!"

"All the articles are superb! ...I thoroughly enjoyed reading it. ...The Pleistocene Coalition represents a constructive means for getting to the new paradigm by its exposition of evidence the public would never see otherwise... and its open-ended point of view."

"WOW...this is an amazing issue. ...academics need to realize that the public is and will be informed."

"I absolutely loved the latest issue of PCN—really solid points of view and so well expressed."

"Perhaps with an open, public forum such as PC, honest and innovative academics will now have a light to guide their way. Please do send me the back issues of PC and/or keep me on your mailing list."

"I am very happy to have found the Pleistocene Coalition."

"I have read every page with interest. ...It is something that will start to erode the stubborn entrenchment of the archeological establishment."

"Excellent and most interesting! Acknowledgement for the editors!"

"I have intuition this has potential to cause a stir in the greater world."

"Congratulations for the fantastic achievement! I am impressed by your energy and results."

"An awesome issue."

"I am indeed impressed by the high quality of the publication! Well done!"

"Congratulations! This is a splendid site - easily accessible with good pithy texts."

"Congratulations for your constant efforts in bringing out this e-journal Pleistocene coalition successfully. Its really interesting to go through each of the issues."

"A very very impressive issue. Should make anybody start to question and rethink their understanding of ancient man. A lot to digest in just one issue."

"There are some extraordinarily brilliant articles in all the Pleistocene Coalition Newsletters... and each issue deserves to be read from cover to cover."
Solutrean solutions—Goodman’s *American Genesis* ahead of the game

By David Campbell

Dennis Stanford, Bruce Bradley and Michael Collins have recently published a book called *Across Atlantic Ice* (2012), which puts forth the hypothesis that the Clovis culture has roots in the Upper Paleolithic. A wealth of documentation including the most recent archaeological evidence is presented to add strong support for what is considered to be a radical idea. Stanford is believed to have first presented the Solutrean Solution at the Clovis and Beyond Conference... around 1998...

This was considered a radical departure from mainstream thought at the time... In fact it was a fairly timid step to take and by no means a novel one. It is also a half step at best.

If one is to find a truly courageous step forward one must go back to 1981 and read *American Genesis* by geologist/archaeologist Jeffrey Goodman, PhD. Jeff Goodman—a Pleistocene Coalition contributor and staunch supporter of the coalition’s core philosophy—was not the first to present the paradigm-shifting material found within *American Genesis* and its sequel *The Genesis Mystery* (1983) but, to my knowledge, he was the first to put all its controversial contents into a coherent body of work. It certainly resulted in a profound alteration of my own worldview and that of many like-minded individuals of my generation. Goodman’s research provided a treasure trove of information dating back to the 19th century, and his personal discoveries and interactions with Stanford, our own Virginia Steen-McIntyre, and many other stellar figures in the dissident professional community landed him a key role in his own right.

Like Louis Leakey, Virginia Steen-McIntyre, George Carter and many others in the dissident community, Dr. Goodman took his lumps for bucking the mainstream tide; like the others he never gave in to go with the flow. Moreover, Goodman put in print ideas that were considered the kiss of death to anyone contemplating a professional career. Indeed, more than one career had suffered premature burial previously championing such heresies. Among such thoughts was the assertion that human presence in the Americas was an order of magnitude older than presently accepted. Additionally, these humans were of the anatomically modern type mostly predating those of Africa and Asia. Finally, incorporating the long discredited ‘Reverse Migration Hypothesis,’ New World modern humans were the ancestors of their Old World counterparts. Leakey suspected it, others believed it and Native Americans had maintained it all along.

Jeff Goodman is still recovering from recent surgery. He graciously gave *PCN* permission to reprint excerpts from his published work. It is an honor to do so and will provide a background to his forthcoming book.

—David Campbell

Migration in Reverse

In Chapter 7 of *American Genesis*, Dr. Goodman wrote:

"Based on evidence now coming to light, I believe that there was a migration in reverse. Instead of nomadic hunters coming from the Old World to populate the New World, I believe that the Paleo-Indians from the New World, the first fully modern men anywhere in the world, traveled to the Old World and woke it from its evolutionary sleep. If the Bering Bridge marked the route, then the path of migration was from North America to Siberia, Asia and then Europe."

"One of the great moments in mankind’s history, celebrated and commemorated in book after book, is the first appearance of modern man (called Cro-Magnon..."

> Cont. on page 6
American Genesis (cont.)

man) in Europe. Cave dwelling, cave painting Cro-Magnon man’s sudden appearance in Europe is generally considered the first appearance of modern man on a world-wide basis with the possible exception of a slightly earlier debut in the Middle East. Some researchers (such as Dr. Arthur Jelinek of the University of Arizona) believe that modern man appeared in the Middle East a few thousand years earlier based upon the Skhul site on Mt. Carmel in Israel. The skull from that site is dated at 38,000 years while the earliest fully modern skull from Europe dates to 35,000 years. Before Cro-Magnon man appeared 35,000 years ago Europe was populated by the Neanderthals who represented an evolutionary and cultural dead end. Compared to what was going on in the New World at this time, Europe was a cultural backwater. With the influx of the biologically fully modern, high-forheaded Cro-Magnons, the Neanderthals were displaced ‘overnight’ and Europe made a quantum leap forward biologically and culturally.”

“I believe the Cro-Magnon men came from the New World where they had already been living for over 40,000 years and represent a specific example of the migration in reverse. ... Similarities in physical appearance, tool types and the shaman-based religions of both the Paleo-Indians and Cro-Magnon man, noted by a number of researchers, testify to this specific connection. For decades, these undeniable links were regarded only as anomalous curiosities. But now, with the earlier datings for the Paleo-Indians in the New World, we can finally see how these links point to a great debt the peoples and races of the world owe to the American Indian.”

Points To Be Made

Much has been made of comparisons of Solutrean lithics and those of the Clovis culture in America by Stanford and Bradley but Goodman points out that these had been observed a good time earlier by lithics authority Francois Bordes in his classic The Old Stone Age. Early on critics pointed out the gap in time between the Solutrean culture of Western Europe, 19,000 BCE – 16,000 BCE which Bordes described as a vigorous but short-lived culture, and Clovis 11, 500 BCE-8,000 BCE, even shorter-lived but no less vigorous. That gap was closed if one accepted the Meadowcroft, Cactus Hill, McGee’s Point, and Tlapocoya sites, which supported the even older Lake Lewisville dated initially at 38,000 BCE.

At the time American Genesis was written there was stiff resistance to such acceptance, to say the least. The Lake Lewisville, Texas site was widely rejected due to ignite contamination of the radiocarbon dating which was in its infancy at the time. Ironically, it was Dennis Stanford who returned to Lewisville during the late ’80’s at a time when severe drought had lowered the level of the lake. He found more lithics which supported the earlier dating. ‘Clovis First’ advocates were stymied by the lack of Clovis precursors in Eurasia to support their late migration scenario. Had they accepted the older sites earlier they would have found those precursors, though not in the locations they would have preferred. Were they to finally accept the truly older sites such as Calico, Hueyatla, El Horno, Texas Street, and Lake Mohave (undated) the precursors would be the least of unsettling realizations they would experience. As early as the late 1950’s E.F. Greenman and his student Arthur Jelinek were undergoing such epiphanies and confirming them in Spain, France and the Americas. Greenman published his Solutrean Solution in 1963. Meanwhile the similarities between the Sandia points of New Mexico and the single shoulder points of the French Laugerie-Haute impressed Bordes enough that he wrote a special paper on it, in which he noted true Sandia points and associated tools also appeared in Alberta, Canada. The uniqueness of the Sandia points makes them ideal for pinpointing contacts, Goodman wrote in 1981. I believe an accurate dating of the New Mexico, Canadian, and French Sandia points can reveal the route north to the Bering Bridge and the Old World from New Mexico.

The Clovis sites at Blackwater Draw, New Mexico, Lindenmeier, Colorado, and Sandia Cave, New Mexico, also yield polished projectile > Cont. on page 7
American Genesis (cont.)

“Similarities in physical appearance, tool types and the shaman-based religions of both the Paleo-Indians and Cro-Magnon man...testify to this specific connection. For decades, these undeniable links were regarded only as anomalous curiosities.” -1981, Jeffrey Goodman PhD

Fig. 1. A Paleo-Indian wrench from Murray Spring, Arizona, made out of mammoth bone. It was used for straightening spear foreshafts of bone while the shafts were still green and pliable. This 'shaft straightener' is exactly like objects used by Cro-Magnon man in Europe where French archaeologists refer to them as "Batons de Commandement." Artifact is in the Arizona State Museum. American Genesis, page 169, Jeffrey Goodman, PhD. 1981 Summit Books (Simon & Schuster).

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. Website: anarchaeology.com

Jeffrey Goodman, PhD, is an archaeologist and geologist. He received a professional degree in Geological Engineering from Colorado School of Mines, an M.A. in anthropology from the University of Arizona, an M.B.A from Columbia University Graduate School of Business, and a PhD in anthropology from California Coast University. Goodman was accredited by the former Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) from 1978 to 1987. His books, American Genesis and The Genesis Mystery, include accounts of his discovery of an early man site in the mountains outside of Flagstaff, Arizona (See PCN #11, May-June 2011, The Flagstaff Stone: A Paleo-Indian engraved stone from Flagstaff, Arizona). Four seasons were devoted to excavating this site, the last of which included archeologists from the University of Alberta, Canada.
An objective reassessment of “Evo-Devo”¹ and evolutionary selection theory

Jörn Greve (Lischeid) and Gerhard Neuhäuser (Linden)

Note from the editors: The editors have done their best to represent this originally longer piece accurately. For more detail, one may contact the authors through the Pleistocene Coalition.

A paper by Chris Stringer recently published in the journal Nature motivated us to offer some new thoughts and suggestions regarding evolutionary selection theory. In agreement with Stringer, genetic studies support the hypothesis of “DNA intermingling” from Denisovan people of Central Asia even with the genome of Australian aborigines. Stringer just offers the possibility of interbreeding as an explanation of this peculiar finding. However, in addition to this simplification, other consequences are to be seen, and to preserve anything resembling an objective modern evolutionary science requires an almost total transformation of familiar hypotheses toward the settlement of Australia, until now dated at about 60.000 bp (Bowlder, 1990). Only a few scientific publications state another possibility; from analyzing archaeological findings, quite different conclusions are necessary: Acheulian tools located beneath volcanic ashes on Java date about 400,000 ybp considering a volcanic eruption which occurred around this time.

If these two facts—results of DNA and tool analyses—are combined they tell quite another story of what we call human Devo: Australia and even its population have a separate background with a markedly expanded time span. But this is not the whole story. By modifying Stringer’s explaining figure (Fig. 1) more developmental possibilities become apparent. This aspect is supported by the fact that bipedalism has not been a singularly human ability since the time of the dinosaurs which in several instances were also bipedal. The new picture of Devo reveals an “origin of mankind separate from the ape species, suggesting now that man was a primary pedestrian from the beginning (s. “Homme Pieton” according to Deloison, 2004). Therefore, this figure modified and extended, supports the idea of a specified origin of men with a multiregional “development.”

Fig. 1. By modifying Stringer’s explaining figure (above) more developmental possibilities become apparent. ...The new picture of Devo reveals an origin of mankind separate from the ape species, suggesting now that man was a primary pedestrian from the beginning (s. “Homme Pieton” according to Deloison, 2004). Therefore, this figure modified and extended, supports the idea of a specified origin of men with a multiregional “development.”

1 The informal abbreviation “Evo-Devo” stands for evolutionarily developmental biology. It involves combining the results of Mendel’s plant experiments and those of molecular genetics with Darwin’s proposals. Darwin’s natural selection may be neglected as the importance of socio-epigenetics show. In the same way a radical multiregional thesis as stressed here after a first step by Milford Wolpoff and Kate Wong supports not only a re-thinking of Darwinism but also would be a basis for “INCLUSION” as a counterpart to selection. This also demonstrates biological-social reciprocity as a universal regarding sustainability and bio-diversity.

> Cont. on page 9
Reassessing “Evo-Devo” (cont.)

origin of mankind separate from the ape species, suggesting now that man was a primary pedestrian from the beginning (s. “Homme Piton” according to Deloison, 2004). Therefore, Fig. 1, modified and extended, includes the possibility of a specified origin of men with a multiregional “development” whatever that may mean on a much broader baseline.

The archaeological horizon and suggested interpretation

Summing up nearly all findings of australopithecine skeletal remnants Bosinski already in 1982 demonstrated a distribution all over the world from Java to Georgia. But he did not give any conclusion to suggest the possibility of multiregional development though it was only a brief time till older findings being purportedly linked to Homo habilis (Africa) or Homo erectus (Eurasia).

There exists no old or recent explanation why the expansion of hominids has been so extensive without any pressure and considering low developed technology. But Bosinski is still in accordance with the anthropological discourse of Tattersall, Johanson, Coppens, Howell in the Leakey tradition (s. Special Edition of Scientific American, 1996; in German: Spektrum-Dossier 3/2000; s. also Senckenberg-Zeitschrift Natur und Museum, “Paläoanthropologie,” Bd.139, 2009).

Suggesting a “patchwork planet” as Stringer does by comparing findings of DNA analyses already includes the possibility that there might be different origins of mankind. So empirical data are helpful to discuss certain aspects of reality and not getting lost in obscurities: The results show that genetic differences between apes and men are less than 2%. On the other hand, probes of our suggested African ancestors are within the same level as was found recently.

“Strange” DNA may be present in the African population with-out similarity to apes or anyone else; therefore, another origin for humans could be assumed.

In addition, neuro-behavioural characteristics and their neuro-anatomical and functional peculiarities especially vestibular regulation (related to the sense of balance) are at present not determinable from what are regarded as Pre-Hominid remains. If they were, they might be suggestive of manliness. This would show that our original “species” was more manlike than similar to apes. This certainly would be the case if more bipedal hominids are found showing a particular morphology of pelvis and allowing a functional interpretation of gait and walking.

This suggestion of diversity in origin would include many other species. In fact, there are more animals being bipedal (as the birdlike-apparitions of dinosaurs about 400-200 million years ago). Bipedalism is so dominant in the history of life as evidenced in paleontological horizons that it cannot be regarded as particular to man. Also, there are quite a few Mesozoic animals that were isolated or rare with their morphological aberrations neglected until now (s. Greve and Neuhäuser, 2010b).

An extended time span of our predecessors is proved by the resilience of Neanderthals. They have been dominant in the North-Eastern hemisphere and showed brilliant sustainability because of being social and acting in small groups for more than 400,000 years. Thus, their genome must have been predominant in Eurasia. But it was also found in Australia, India(?), and in the Indonesian archipelago, which shows that Homo sapiens sapiens was not only dependent upon Homo sapiens neanderthalensis, but his genome also was incorporated by interbreeding: Genome analyses show a mixture with Neanderthal genes up to 5%.

Perhaps this fact is responsible for the expansive and even destructive but also more innovative behaviour seen as characteristic for Homo sapiens sapiens, to say nothing about racist and ethnocentric aspects of an independent “superior” being. On the other hand, lacking socio-ethic behaviour under mass conditions provided resilience for Neanderthals. But these mass collective pathoethological characteristics might also result from being globalized, as cultural clashes demonstrate resulting from “overcrowding” f. i. on Easter Islands or Yucatan (Maya and before in the Olmec-Culture, s. Diamond’s theses under discussion).

Denisovians from Central Asia are involved also to build up a patchwork of the Homo sapiens genome, which then might be transformed further by epigenetic influences to result in a destructive mass collective functionality.

Considering the timetable behind these facts it is more than amazing that the percentage of Denisovian DNA reaches 5% coming from a Central-Asian population being on the way to the South leaving behind Homo floresiensis, as early as assumed until now at about a questionable 15,000 years ago. And it is not sure whether there will be other DNA-data to prove another dating (see also adaptation of Stringer’s picture in figure 1, where this part is cut from the original publication in Nature; s. Greve and Neuhäuser, 2010a): Contrary to Stringer’s view, there is no proof to assign Homo floresiensis a special origin. Epigenetic effects of isolation are assumed to result in an “elf-like” dwarfish appearance (like some fossil animals on Malta).

From a mainstream science point of view, this evidence is thought to support the conclusion that a genetic separation started long before the purported differentiation of the species ape and “men” at about...
Reassessing “Evo-Devo” (cont.)

5 mya took place. As stated above the timetable already assures that Australia was set-tled as usually suggested around 60 kya (s. Bowdler). However, tools found on Java indicate that a population is possible even at the beginning of Pleisto-cene, which means 300,000 ybp. Therefore, purported trans-formation of the genome coming from the Denisovian must have been dated earlier and results some kind of cultural clash but environmental alterations due to climatic changes over time were also responsible for transfor-mations. These are also not correctly demonstrated by Fig. 2, which shows the increasing population since Gravettian (upper part of Fig. 2) and indi-cates the possibility of a fractal woven snake-like “line” instead of a linear stream coming up from one or more sources.

Animals not only disappeared in certain regions with the arrival of Mod-ern Men (upper part of Fig. 2) but similarly before when Mammoths retreated to the north as they were killed by Neanderthals and Modern Men both. Other animals became smaller; and gregarious animals were rare especially since Middle Pleistocene because of rapid climatic changes and long lasting glaciers followed by a rapid warming up at the end of the last glaciation (known as “Würm-Eiszeit”).

Conclusions

The popular timetables of hu-man development do not seem to follow any kind of linear pattern. There seems to be no continuity in evolving Modern Men. Even the recent Out-of-Africa thesis as stressed by Stringer (2011) has to be debated, not to mention the fact that Yves Coppens—co-discoverer along with Donald Johanson and Maurice Taieb of the australopithecine fossil known as “Lucy”—now doubts his own “East-Side-Story” (the idea that the African Rift Valley split an ancestral ape species in half with the east side becoming humans and the west side becoming the apes we see today). Collectively, results concerning the origin of man-kind are demonstrating little more than a patchwork. On a more technical level, different DNA-clusters and turbulences may have been driven by floating densities or by periodic spontaneity of flow due to inherent crossing over, or to epigenetic impulses (growth processes) leading to transfor-mations in a permanent pro-cess of self-organization. All of this diversity is chaos-related—including the ontogenetic develop-ment of individual humans.
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The graphics of Bilzingsleben series
Scientific misconduct over ancient artifact studies and why you should care

Part 8: Evidence for a Homo erectus campsite depiction in 3D

By John Feliks

All mainstream scientists, by virtue of their ubiquitous faith in Darwin, have interpreted the 350,000-year-old engravings from Bilzingsleben Germany as the work of “ape-men.” At the UISPP Congress, the nature and exactness of the details in Artifact 6 were proposed to represent something even less believable than Lower Paleolithic art from the evolutionary standpoint—drafting or “technical drawing” of a high caliber including 3D perspective with enough information to create a three-dimensional duplicate in physical space.

‘Artistic’ representations are usually known for their subjective or emotional qualities. Technical or engineering drawings, on the other hand, are known for conveying very specific objective information or facts including measurable elements in several dimensions.

It is not common, even in modern times, for both artistic and technical qualities to be expressed freely and equally in the most, they have granted these early Homo erectus people a simple rudimentary language—just enough to let them hunt and perhaps build campfires; but to think like us? Not a chance, because that would suggest that humans have always had the same level of intelligence, and that would be contrary to Darwinism which believes that human cognition evolves over time.

However, unlike the other engravings from Bilzingsleben which are perhaps easier to interpret in mainstream terms, the engravings of Artifact 6 (Figs. 1-8) are very obviously the work of a skilled and experienced—if not professional—artist.

Despite the rigorous geometric evidence presented in 112 slides at the XV UISPP Congress in Lisbon, 2006, in The Graphics of Bilzingsleben, the science community found it critical to block this paper from publication. Much of this censorship, apart from a 5-year effort by the Congress editors themselves, was done through anonymous peer review at the Journal of Human Evolution. After 15 years of similar experience this was a final straw. Connecting up with other researchers censored in the same way—and some, like Virginia Steen-McIntyre for 40 years—was how the Pleistocene Coalition was formed to demonstrate that mainstream anthropology cannot be trusted to provide the public with an objective picture of human prehistory.

At the UISPP Congress, the nature and exactness of the details in Artifact 6 were proposed to represent something even less believable than Lower Paleolithic art from the evolutionary standpoint—drafting or ‘technical drawing’ of a high caliber including 3D perspective with enough information to create a three-dimensional duplicate in physical space.
**Homo erectus** campsite depiction in 3D (cont.)

By Albrecht Dürer or Leonardo da Vinci. In other words, if the engravings of Artifact 6 are in any way what they are suggested to be then the old description of early peoples such as Homo erectus as being less intelligent than us is simply no longer tenable.

### Straight edge use by Homo erectus

The few details on the Artifact 6 project presented at the UISPP conference and in the subsequent thesis paper were enough to show the completely modern level of Homo erectus intelligence without any ambiguity. They included 20-30 falsifiable proofs that the engravers at Bilzingsleben edge.

In modern times, prior to the advent of computer-aided design or computer-aided drafting (CAD), the straight edge was the most important drafting tool. With the number and transparency of proofs presented at the UISPP Congress as well as submitted to the *Journal of Human Evolution*, for these organizations to argue against straight edge use by Homo erectus or to censor the evidence from publication goes squarely against the standards and ethics of free scientific enquiry because the evidence is empirical, openly-testable, and verifiable by anyone— including modern-day drafters.

Fact 6 was as far backwards (i.e. toward evolutionism) as I was willing to go. Yet even 2D shows a few *stereograms* to assist anyone in seeing the suggested 3D engraving as 3D.

The images are still in process requiring some tweaks but I thought I would offer a few of them here anyway for this section on Artifact 6.

Fig. 8 uses a similar technique to that in Fig. 3 except that the original 6-degree slope of the lower plane has been brought to horizontal to match the plane of the upper tier. The lower plane was also slid further back along the ‘registration guide’ to make the 3D easier to see.
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**Homo erectus** campsite depiction in 3D (cont.)

was actually found in the extinct Pleistocene lake just a few meters behind or North of the campsite proper. This information is added so that the skeptical reader, no doubt thinking that this 3D map idea is improbable, will not automatically assume that the interpretation simply came out of the blue. The suggested map was discovered within a 5-second walk of the campsite. How it wound up in the lake over 300,000 years ago would be harder to explain.

**Conclusion**

The suggestion is that Artifact 6 was engraved as a very deliberate and extremely accurate multi-dimensional map of the campsite by someone who was actually there sometime 320,000-412,000 years ago (the site's date range). In a follow-up issue, the interpretation will be given in two-point perspective as well as multi-view projection (i.e. six different views of the 3D image in standard layout)—enough information to reproduce the engraving in physical 3D space.

Whether or not you believe the 3D interpretation of Artifact 6, one of the main points in The Graphics of Bilzingsleben paper (perhaps available at your local university if they carry British Archaeological Reports) was that 3D is actually the ‘least’ challenging interpretation (see Fig. 4). The face of the artifact (the opposite side has a similar design) consists of over 75 perfectly-straight parallel and angled lines including the special trig angles 30, 45, 60, 90 perpendiculars and planes all within a mere ±3 degrees deviation.

Unfortunately, if you are like most who have gone through standard science training, you came out believing that your ancestors were “ape-people.” This kind of training (or “indoctrination” as I prefer to call it since it was done very deliberately) will automatically disincline you from seeing these engravings as the result of a fully-modern mind. However, from the perspective of a long-time artist and designer, I can tell you with the utmost conviction that whoever did these engravings had already done this kind of thing many times before. And like all the Bilzingsleben engravings Artifact 6 has no errors and, in fact, does not show any onboard experimentation but rather has the qualities of a final draft committed to an archival medium.

**John Feliks** has specialized in the study of early human cognition for nearly twenty years using an approach based on geometry and techniques of drafting. Feliks is not a mathematician; however, he uses the mathematics of ancient artifacts to show that human cognition does not evolve. One aspect of Feliks’ experience that has helped to understand artifacts is a background in music; he is a long-time composer in a Bach-like tradition as well as an acoustic-rock songwriter and taught computer music including MIDI, digital audio editing, and music notation in a college music lab for 11 years.

"**Straight edge use by Homo erectus was the central proof of modern level intelligence provided in The Graphics of Bilzingsleben.**"
Wanjina & Bradshaw-style rock art in other parts of the world

By Vesna Tenodi MA, archaeology; artist and writer

Facts about Australian prehistoric art

Wanjina and Bradshaw cave paintings (e.g., Fig. 1) have been confirmed as being of pre-Aboriginal origin by all the researchers and their Aboriginal informants over the last 200 years. Aborigines have always claimed that they found these images when they colonised the Australian continent. However, over recent years there has been a strong push to reinvent the theory about their origin, for political and legal reasons.

The universal themes in rock art

The Wanjina/Bradshaw symbolic images are one of those universal themes which keep coming up again and again in ancient prehistoric cultures in all parts of the world. In caves and rock shelters on every continent we find the same patterns and symbols, such as spirals and zigzags and lattices and circles, plus a myriad of other motifs. Furthermore, in prehistoric cave art in Europe, Africa, North and South America, Asia and Australia, we find the identical anthropomorphic figures—attributed to prehistoric cultures separated by thousands of years and thousands of kilometers.

This phenomenon of universal symbols in Palaeolithic and Neolithic cultures is well known to archaeologists and rock art aficionados everywhere—except in Australia. Here, archaeologists are forbidden to research and compare, and must keep silent about the fact that there is nothing unique about the Australian rock art imagery. They seem oblivious to the fact that caves on every continent contain the same imagery as Wanjina and Bradshaw paintings in Australia.

In June 2012, the journal Science published new test results showing that cave paintings in Spain, including a red sphere and handprints from a cave called El Castillo, are the oldest in the world. They are at least 40,800 years old, which makes them much older than similar cave art in Australia. The Spanish cave paintings are said to be so ancient they may not have been made by modern man. Some scientists say they might have been made by the Neanderthals, while others disagree and attribute them to earlier races.

The meaning of Wanjina

According to Daisy Bates in The Passing of the Aborigines—a lifetime spent...
The word "Wanjina" means a traveller, the one who travels, or a visitor. Aboriginal tribes named the cave paintings "Wanjinas" because those images were painted by the visitors, and depicted those visiting travellers. Most Aborigines call them "rainbearing clouds," "visitors from the sky," or "the sky spirits."

Other authors claim that Aborigines adopted a Chinese term "wanjin," which means "traveller," or when separated to read "Wan-Jin" means the "golden visitor."

While the Australian Aborigines forgot the meaning and purpose of the iconography contained in pre-Aboriginal rock art, the indigenous people in other parts of the world—who have very similar images in their cultures (e.g., Figs. 2-8)—have retained some knowledge of the original meaning and wisdom encapsulated in symbols. And the indigenous people on other continents interpret these paintings as benevolent, loving figures, using these icons for ceremonial and spiritual purposes.

Wanjina figures on other continents

There are variations of the Wanjina motif, but a typical Wanjina is a geometric, anthropomorphic figure with huge round and hollow eyes, a head surrounded by halo-like circles or rays, or with a feather-like head-dress. The most ancient images did have a mouth, but that feature was excluded from more recent paintings. Another distinct feature is an oval pectoral spot. While Wanjina is a geometric and static, somewhat clumsy figure, Bradshaw paintings are elegant "dancers on the wall."

Among the most amazing examples of cave art are rock drawings in Valcamonica, in the Italian Alps, with more than 150,000 prehistoric petroglyphs, and rock paintings dated about 10,000 BC, with motifs and figures identical to Australian rock art. Valcamonica images are often called "alien art," for either depicting aliens or having been created by aliens.

Rise or plunge?

Were these images from Australian cave shelters and elsewhere left by a highly advanced mysterious race, before the arrival of primitive tribes and the plunge into the stone-age? Were these a teaching tool, with pre-Aboriginal people trying to
communicate knowledge and pass on wisdom to the newcomers? Were these copied by Aborigines in the deep past, while they still remembered the meaning behind the symbols?

The recent stone-age may not be the beginning but the end, not the rise but the fall of mankind. That which is regarded as the dawn of civilisation may in fact be just a new beginning, a start of yet another cycle, a new rise in the succession of peaks and troughs of human life on earth.

This article is the third in a series by the author. See also:


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. She is also developing a theory of the pre-Aboriginal races which she calls 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
Email: ves@theplanet.net.au

FIG. 9. Valcamonica, Italy. The halo-like snake arrangement over the head of this controversial figure purportedly dated c. 12,000 years old are similar to the ones in the petroglyphs from Toro Muerto, Peru.

FIG. 7. Valcamonica, Italy, Warriors with Rayed Helmets. Image is in the public domain.

‘Wanjin,’ which means ‘traveller,’ or when separated to read ’Wan-Jin’ means the ‘golden visitor.’”
Avocational archaeology

How to give an audio/visual presentation
By Virginia Steen-McIntyre PhD
Tephrochronologist (Volcanic ash specialist)

Have you ever thought of giving an oral presentation at a professional meeting but didn’t know how to go about it? Things look very different from the two sides of a speakers’ podium! A well-prepared talk, while seeming ho-hum easy to a relaxed audience actually requires tens of hours of preparation by the presenter, and if the laser pointer he uses dances the light beam on the screen, you know that his calm demeanor is only a pose!

Some lucky people can speak off-the-cuff and do a great job. They actually seem to enjoy an audience. For us more reticent folk, the thought of standing and speaking in front of an audience causes mental and even physical pain. The more time we have to prepare and the more aids we can use to help us the better.

Basic rules
There are a few basic rules to start with when giving a professional talk:

1. Keep it simple: Usually people attend a conference to relax, meet old colleagues, make new contacts, discover new ideas, and see the local sites. They will not be geared to absorb a ton of complex new material. Have handouts available with this type of information, and/or refer them to a website.

2. Keep it short: Allow at least five minutes of your allotted time for set-up, take-down, and questions. That means for a 15-minute space your talk should last no more than 10 minutes.

3. Memorize your talk: This will force you to keep it simple, and you will be more apt to raise your head and make eye-contact with your audience, always a good idea.

4. Use power-point or slides: Use the conference room screen, not only for images, charts, and graphs, but also for simple segments of your talk, in brief outline. They will be there to clue you in case you lose your train of thought.

5. Memorize especially your introduction and conclusion: Be able to give them in your sleep! No matter how rough the body of your talk, you will leave a good impression if you do.

Cont. on page 18
How to give an audio/visual presentation (cont.)

The abstract
Most professional conferences will require you to submit an abstract of your talk for them to consider. They will supply the rules; follow them faithfully.

Plan to write your abstract over several times! ... I usually write my draft one saying what I would like to say if I had 500 words to say it in, then start to condense, delete, and rearrange from there.

Fig. 3. Simple table with limited data: Uranium-series dates—Hueyatlaço, Camel Pelvis, 245,000 ± 100,000 ybp, El Horno Mastodon Tooth, >280,000 ybp.

The body of the talk
You will need an introduction to your subject. It should be as interesting and as terse as your abstract. You might have up on the screen at the time a text image giving the main thrust of your talk (See for example Fig. 1 on prior page). Keep the text font simple and big enough so that the viewer in the back row can read it easily. A good rule of thumb bc (before computers) was to type in caps and limit the area to be photographed for the slide to no larger than that of a standard-size postcard.

A white background for text slides is too harsh; it tires the eyes. Better is a cream color or light blue background, with most of the text in black, carried through for all text slides and graphics to visually hold the talk together (See for example Fig. 2 on prior page).

Most tables contain far too much information and have no place in a professional talk. A very simple table with limited data can be useful (Fig. 3). If you don’t plan to discuss an item on the table, leave it out. Better to use a simple graph, pie chart, simple map, etc. (Figs. 4-5).

A light pointer is almost a necessity to draw your viewers’ attention to items on the screen, but you’ll need practice using one. Always come into your image from the same spot, say, the upper right corner, and move the pointer slowly to your object. Circle it slowly once or twice (but no more) as you discuss it. Click the light off when finished with your comment.

For your last slide/image, on screen as you verbally sum up, you can have something eye-catching and related to your subject but also artistically pleasing. Leave it up for a moment or so after your concluding remarks as you prepare to leave the platform.

Presentation
As mentioned earlier, you will want to give your talk from memory, using mental aids in the form of a set of simple text outlines flashed on the screen and interspersed with your photos and graphics (Fig. 6). The best way to do this, as suggested to me over 50 years ago by an old colleague,
How to give an audio/visual presentation (cont.)

Roald Fryxell, is to give the talk 14 times without looking at your notes. The first few times will be an agony, and you will quickly see where the thoughts are too complex, where items must be cut to fit into your time limit, or family member to sit in and critique. After that, other than rehearsing your introduction and conclusion once a night, you should be confident and ready to go!

Poster Sessions
Poster sessions came into the media mix after my time. They are more informal, need catchy graphics, and can give one a chance to interact on a more personal level with interested colleagues. Would one of our readers like to offer some friendly advice on how to present one?

Addendum:
If you are participating in Paulette Steeves’ session, “Shifting Archeological Borders and Boundaries: Decolonizing History and Academia,” to be held at the upcoming SAA (Society of American Archaeology) Conference in Hawaii April 3-7 (announced in our August mailing) this would be a good time to try the techniques and guidelines offered here. The deadline for Paulette’s session is passed although you could e-mail her and confirm that this is actually so:
Paulette Steeves
<psteeve1@binghamton.edu>

However, if it is something you would like to do you could still start working on a conference presentation anyway because they occur regularly throughout the world.

Reference

Virginia Steen-McIntyre, PhD, is a tephrochronologist (volcanic ash specialist) involved in preserving and publishing the Palaeolithic evidence from Valsequillo since the late 1960s. Her story first came to public attention in Michael Cremo’s and Richard Thompson’s book, Forbidden Archeology (1993), and in the Bill Cote television special, Mysterious Origins of Man, hosted by Charleton Heston (1996).
• 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.

The Pleistocene Coalition

Prehistory is about to change