This special Anniversary Issue of PCN honors two fallen heroes of the battle for truth in science and harkens back to one of the primary reasons the Pleistocene Coalition exists—as a response to mainstream suppression of evidence related to human origins and prehistory. Archaeologist Chris Hardaker, one of the founding members of the PC in 2009, was not afraid to take a stand against suppression in anthropology despite the fact that it meant sacrifices in his career. We touch on the causes and effects of suppression in several articles. USGS geologist Chuck Naeser was internationally renowned for development of fission-track dating and provided the pivotal 250,000-year old dates for the Valsequillo site in east-central Mexico.

Award-winning author Bonnye Matthews' first novella, Freedom, 250,000 BC, is dedicated to the suppressed Valsequillo site outside Puebla, Mexico. Valsequillo is the 250,000-year old site kept before the public by PC founding member Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre (volcanic ash specialist) for an astonishing 50 years. “That date is the glory and infamy” of Valsequillo, says Matthews who chose the site for her first novella in the series because of the controversy—not despite it. p.5.

David Campbell gets to the heart of what it means to be an avocational archaeologist and the importance of continuing to raise the bar. p.13.

For more on PC founding member Chris Hardaker see John Feliks p.3.

Thoughts on the geochronology at Hueyatlaco: How solid geochronology got trashed (Reprint from PCN #11 May-June 2011)
By Charles W. Naeser, PhD, geologist, p.7

VSM on Hardaker and Naeser (next page) September 2017 was a traumatic month—Several hurricanes, major earthquakes, saber-rattling by unstable dictators. And it was in September that we learned of the deaths of two Pleistocene Coalition colleagues: Chuck Naeser in November 2016 and the sudden passing of close buddy Chris Hardaker this past August. Chuck was the fission-track expert from the U.S. Geological Survey who, along with geochemist Barney Szabo gave us the old numbers for the age of the Hueyatlaco site...

(For complete article see p.2.)
A few words about the late Chris Hardaker MA and Chuck Naeser PhD

By Virginia Steen-McIntyre, PhD geologist, volcanic ash specialist

"Chuck was the fission-track expert from the USGS who, along with geochemist Barney Szabo gave us the old numbers for the age of the Hueyatlaco site. ... Chris was an archaeologist who was not afraid to question establishment dogma."

September 2017 was a traumatic month. Several hurricanes. Major earthquakes. Saber rattling by unstable dictators. And it was in September that we learned of the deaths of two Pleistocene Coalition colleagues: Chuck Naeser in November 2016 and the sudden passing of close buddy Chris Hardaker this past August.

Chuck was the fission-track expert from the U.S. Geological Survey who, along with geochemist Barney Szabo, gave us the old numbers for the age of the Hueyatlaco site (Steen-McIntyre et al., 1981, Geologic evidence for age of deposits at Hueyatlaco archeological site, Valsequillo, Mexico, Quaternary Research 16: 1-17. See Table: 1 & 2 on pages 14 & 15. The above link is: http://pleistocenecoalition.com/steen-mcintyre/Quat.Research_1981.pdf).

Chris was an archaeologist who was not afraid to question establishment dogma. He had wide interests: Early man in both the New World and the old; sacred geometry; hay bale gardens; the layout plan for Washington D.C.; abiogenesis; kiva geometry; organic foods ... He also had a sharp tongue and a ready pen!

Both Chuck and Chris wrote for the PCN newsletter, and both will be sorely missed.

Chris went out swinging. Philanthropist Marshall Payn had recently handed both of us copies of a manuscript on Hueyatlaco produced by another group. He wanted us to help him critique it. We had done so before, and I looked forward to the give-and-take as we three poured through it from our different perspectives. This was a biggie: 36 single-space pages, 19 figures, and nine authors including some big names. My copy was beginning to show a lot of red ink, and I was eager to see Chris’ version. Not to be. Apparently he died while working on it, and his family did not pass it on. So it goes for the Hueyatlaco/Valsequillo project!

Ironically I did catch a couple of serious typos where Chuck Naeser’s work was mentioned!

Virginia Steen-McIntyre, PhD, is a volcanic ash specialist; founding member of the Pleistocene Coalition; and copy editor, author, and scientific consultant for Pleistocene Coalition News. She began her lifelong association with the Hueyatlaco early man site in Mexico in 1966. Her story of suppression—now well-known in the science community—was first brought to public attention in Michael Cremo’s and Richard Thompson’s classic tome, Forbidden Archeology, which was followed by a central appearance in the NBC special, Mysterious Origins of Man in 1996, hosted by Charlton Heston. The program was aired twice on NBC with mainstream scientists attempting to block it.

All of Virginia’s articles in PCN can be accessed directly at the following link:
http://www.pleistocenecoalition.com/2_virginia_steen_mcintyre

PCN reader condolences on the sudden passing of Chris Hardaker

"Dear Editors, I am sorry to hear about your losses—my condolences. Please take all the time in the world—personal loss is the hardest thing to cope with in our lives. But I wanted to let you know that PCN is the most amazing and most important publishing—and I greatly look forward to every issue. Keep up the wonderful work!!! With kind regards from Germany."

"[Chris] was an invaluable member. He always fought for justice. I loved his book. Sorry I never got to meet him."

"Hi John, I am extremely saddened to read of Chris’ passing. ... He seemed so healthy."

"My condolences to you all on your recent losses. Next to family it is our friends, colleagues, listeners, supporters that we hold dear who forge the bonds that leave the biggest voids."

"Chris was a fine man and a friend in our quest for truth."

"Terribly saddened to hear the news. My heart goes out to those with personal knowledge of these people. Hardaker's book had a profound effect on me."

"John, I am shocked to hear of Chris’ passing. ... unbeknownst to either of us, we were both experimenting with bi-polar flaking in our backyards in San Diego at the same time in the 70’s. ... surfers at the same beach but our paths never crossed until I read Chris’ book ... Anyway, I hope all the material that is probably on Chris’ computer ends up with the PC. ...In our communications he didn’t seem like someone who was planning to leave us anytime soon."
A life defending archaeological truth

Remembering PC founding member Chris Hardaker on PCN’s 8th Anniversary

By John Feliks

The Pleistocene Coalition was proposed in July 2009. It’s purpose was to bring evidence of modern intelligence in early peoples as well as evidence of H. erectus and Neanderthal contemporaries in the Americas—all being suppressed by the mainstream science community—to public awareness. The coalition was planned as a website offering a publication venue to bring scientists and other researchers with similar experience together to stand as a unified group against a publication monopoly blocking not only new evidence but also long-established and well-documented evidence about human prehistory. Archaeologist Chris Hardaker (Fig. 1) joined the cause within one day to become one of the Pleistocene Coalition’s original founding members.

Chris was ready for action right out of the gate having just recently published his “benchmark” book (in the words of now PCN editor David Campbell), The first American: The suppressed story of the people who discovered the New World.

In The First American, Chris laid out the suppressed archaeological evidence of the 250,000-year old Valsequillo Site outside Puebla, Mexico, using impeccable materials provided by PC founding member Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre, a USGS volcanic ash specialist involved with the site since 1966. Chris— informed by his 30-years of experience as a professional archaeologist—popularized evidence that only the dogmatic mainstream anthropological community would be incapable of assessing objectively. Dr. Steen-McIntyre, professor at WSU, along with geologist WSU professor Dr. Roald Fryxell (co-investigator of the Marine’s Rockshelter in Washington containing some of the oldest human remains in the western hemisphere at circa 12,000 BP) and distinguished USGS geologist Hal Malde, had already published a good portion of the evidence in an ignored paper, Geologic evidence for age of deposits at Hueyatlaco archaeological site, Valsequillo, Mexico, Quaternary Research 16:1-17, 1981. Link is: http://pleistocenecoalition.com/steen-mcintyre/Quat.Research_1981.pdf. (BTW, to further establish Dr. Fryxell’s qualifications to assess the geology at Hueyatlaco, he was not only one of the geologists chosen by NASA to study the rocks brought back from the Moon during the Apollo program, all six manned landings, but was also designer of the apparatus used for collecting the core samples from the moon’s surface.)

However, Valsequillo is not the only mainstream suppressed site Chris had become an ex-munity ablaze with his team’s discoveries in Africa (longtime PCN editor and writer Tom Baldwin worked at the site when Dr. Leakey was its Director). Dr. Leakey was an international expert on stone tools. However, he suffered continuous harassment at the hands of American anthropologists who thought they knew lithics better and naively referring to the artifacts as “geofacts” because, being 200,000 years old, they were “too old” for the Americas.

Chris was also known for telling the mainstream exactly what he thought of them. On Amazon, when the need for a coalition was in the air, Chris wrote: “I spent over thirty years in this field, and to find out five years ago I was lied to, constantly, by leaders in the Paleoanthropology field was a real problem. If you think real science is carried out by ignoring excellent preClovis evidence that can be characterized as nothing less than pure gold, then you have a lot more to learn about true science.”
Member news and other info

**Obituary excerpts, Charles “Chuck” Naeser, PhD**

Chuck Naeser was a colleague of PC founding member, editor and scientific advisor, Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre. He was a pioneer and international authority on fission-track dating and played a crucial role in dating the Valsequillo, Mexico, early American sites to c. 250,000 years old. Chuck wrote an overview of this work for Pleistocene Coalition News titled, *Thoughts on the geochronology at Hueyatlaco: How solid geochronology got trashed* (PCN #11, May-June 2011). The article is reproduced on p.7 of this issue.

Below are some excerpts from Chuck’s obituary at legacy.com (legacy.com/obituaries/washingtonpost/obituary.aspx?pid=183594928). He is also covered in the Washington Post’s Jan. 2, 2017, section, “Notable deaths in the Washington area.” We thought the following details from Chuck’s career would be of special interest to our readers:

Charles “Chuck” Naeser of Herndon, Virginia, died November 18, 2016. He was 76. Chuck was born in 1940 in Washington, DC. His father, Dr. Charles R. Naeser, was...professor and Chairman of the Chemistry Department at George Washington University. Chuck...obtained an AB (1962) and MA (1964) in geology from Dartmouth College and the first PhD in geological sciences awarded by Southern Methodist University (1967). His 38-year career as a Research Geologist at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) began in 1967...Menlo Park, CA, then...Denver, and from 1993...Reston, VA. Beginning with his Ph.D. thesis, Chuck was a pioneer in the emerging field of fission-track thermochronology, a method for determining the age and thermal history of rocks. He developed many of the techniques and applications of the method that are now used in labs around the world. He tirelessly mentored students and professionals from the U.S. and many other countries who came to his lab. Working with other scientists, he used fission tracks to help solve diverse geological problems in many parts of the world. His 330 papers and abstracts have been cited more than 7,800 times in scientific publications worldwide.

Chuck retired in 2005. Along with his wife, Dr. Nancy D. Naeser, he remained in active research as a Scientist Emeritus at the USGS in Reston. In September 2016, he became only the second recipient of the Lasslett Prize, an international award for “extraordinary contribution to the field of fission-track thermochronology.”...He spent many happy hours running model trains for the annual holiday train shows at the USGS and Colvin Run Mill Park in Reston. He enjoyed skiing from his earliest days at Dartmouth to his last ski day, at age 75, on Easter Sunday 2016 in Colorado, with his son.


**Neanderthal glue implications confirm PC long ahead of the game**

Engineer and petroglyph researcher and preservationist, Ray Urbaniak, suggests readers consider the significance of recently-discovered 200,000-year-old Neanderthal glue (“New experiment reveals secret behind 200,000-year-old Neanderthal glue.” Gizmodo.com. http://gizmodo.com/new-experiment-reveals-secret-behind-200-000-year-old-n-1798636925?utm_medium=sharefromsite&utm_source=Gizmodo_facebook&utm_campaign=sharefromsite). Eds. Comment: The creation of glue is just like the creation and use of fire, spears and other tools, or the creation of personal ornaments or bone engravings, all known from Neanderthal sites. None of these things suggest a lesser human condition than that of modern humans. The problem for the main-stream is that all of these things except the glue are known from Homo erectus sites as well. There can be little doubt that most ‘modern’ humans living in today’s world of ever-advancing technologies, if dropped by parachute into a hostile wilderness environment, would not be able to survive without ready-made tools or knowledge of survival skills.

**5.7 million-year-old footprints found on Crete**

Experimental archaeologist Dr. Dragos Gheorghiu (Bucharest National University of Arts, Romania) and psychologist Dr. Terry Bradford both sent recommendations for readers to consider the 5.7 million-year-old footprints recently discovered on the Greek island of Crete in the Mediterranean. See “Controversial footprints suggest we evolved in Europe not Africa,” New Scientist, 9-4-17. Eds. Comment: Contrary to the article’s title the footprints do not suggest anything at all about evolution. Although most write-ups on the topic immediately jump to ape-human evolution speculations, in reality, there is no association between the footprints and any specific creatures that might have made them. Like in all
such cases—e.g., the Johanson & White Laetoli/Australopithecus fiasco described below—any speculations about fossil footprints should be conservative. Tim White stated directly about the Laetoli footprints, “Make no mistake,” they are “like modern human footprints.” Yet he and Johanson chose to publicly associate them with the ape, Australopithecus, commandeering their naming and announcement before their discoverer’s presentation where Mary Leakey was going to announce them as the oldest ‘human’ footprints. As it turns out since that time, the known fossil feet of australopithecines do not match the Laetoli footprints.

Award-winning Alaskan author, Bonnye Matthews, sent us copies of her latest novels and novellas. They are written from the perspective of suppressed archaeological sites essentially blocked from the public by the anthropology community. Of special interest to the Pleistocene Coalition is her novella titled Freedom, 250,000 BC. It is based on the 50-year suppressed evidence from the Valsequillo sites, such as Hueyatlaco, near the city of Puebla in east-central Mexico for which PC founding member, Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre was involved since 1966. PC founding member and archaeologist, the late Chris Hardaker, and PC founding member and world-famous diatomist, the late Sam VanLandingham, also became involved with the site decades later. In the book’s Introduction, Matthews explains how the site has been buried over as a result of dogmatic beliefs. She then gives an abbreviated though very good overview of the important archaeological discoveries and evidence from the site.

While Matthews’ book presents an enjoyable fictional story it is placed in a context which she has taken the time to thoroughly research and understand. She writes in the Dedication:

“Freedom, 250,000 BC is dedicated to the archaeological site south of Puebla, Mexico at the Valsequillo Reservoir. What the site shows is an amazingly rich prehistoric view of human life in the Americas, specifically Mexico, in 250,000 BC. That date is the glory and infamy of the Valsequillo site.” She says that she chose Valsequillo as location for her first novella “because of the controversy—not despite it.” Her two novels; Freedom, 250,000 BC; and Courage, 30,000 BC (based on the Brazilian site Pedra Furada covered in PCN) she is also planning to offer in audio book form. Each focuses on archaeological sites that archaeologists in the U.S. consider “controversial” but for which Matthews explains other countries are “not so skeptical.” The book hits certain emotional chords for its readers as seen in these comments on Amazon:

“It is a wonderful nights’ read about the coming of age and voyage of self discovery of a young Homo erectus man, absorbing.”

“Very few authors tackle the very ancient past...The story’s setting is in an area...where ancient findings have upended the Archaeological community... Well researched as is all work done by this author.”

Matthews weaves geological, paleontological, and anthropological history into a story with adventure, romance, and spiritual enlightenment.”

So, if you are looking for a well-researched novella in a compelling setting with great storytelling, check out Freedom, 250,000 BC.”

Minor errata correction from Layout editor

While replying to a reader asking about the Objective Stratigraphic Column project (most recently, cores, PCN #46, Jan-Feb 2017), I took the opportunity to re-read some older issues of PCN. In the process I found an error of recollection on my part. Re-calling back my teen years described in Tales of a fossil collector, Part 2 (PCN #25, Sept-Oct 2012) and writing ad lib I mistakenly wrote that I was a subscriber to Earth Science magazine. I then realized that I had mixed up my many years of Earth Science, 1968–1973, with a later correspondence about proposed articles I had with Earth Science magazine’s Editor-in-Chief, the late Dr. Richard M. Pearl. Dr. Pearl was a well-known mineralogist and Professor of Geology at Colorado College. He was also co-founder of AFMS—American Federation of Mineralogical Societies. I regularly attended AFMS shows as a teenager and that is most likely where my many Earth Science magazines came from. As mentioned, in the article, Dr. Pearl had expressed an interest in my articles but minus the humorous aspects I had proposed or what he referred to as “controversial” topics. The two articles, never rewritten or published, were “Why Trilobites?” (controversial as it was about the psychology behind fossil collecting) and “Graveyard Fossils” (about the Pennsylvanian-age site in the quarry behind the cemetery at St. Aloysius Church, Paris, Illinois. Earth Science provided some of the sites I visited with friends across the U.S. and Ontario over about 30 years time. -jf

> Cont. on page 6
Two main reasons for suppression of evidence in anthropology

The Pleistocene Coalition was formed in 2009 as a response to the mainstream’s suppression of evidence that early humans were just as intelligent as modern humans and that such people were living contemporaneously in Africa, Europe, Asia, and the Americas.

The first reason anthropology blocks from the public evidence from ancient American sites like Valsequillo and Calico—dated as much as 250,000-years old (sites including not only superb stone tools acknowledged by famed anthropologist Dr. Louis Leakey but also bone engravings and personal ornaments)—is because it clearly contradicts the idea that early people were not intelligent enough to make it to the Americas. The problem is that they have long aggressively promoted this idea as “fact.” In nearly 50 issues of PCN we have published professionally-obtained and documented dates for archaeological evidence not by dogmatically-committed anthropologists but by the U.S. Geological Survey, members of NASA’s Apollo program, and other internationally-renowned experts such as fossil diatom experts along with rigorous analyses of cultural evidence that early human abilities were top notch.

The second reason for the blocking of evidence in anthropology is the well-known misconduct problem in the field in which lone-wolf researchers block or demean the work of competitors so that they can obtain a semblance of priority, though ill-gained. One famous example is that of the 3.6 million-year-old Laetoli footprints discovered by Mary Leakey about to be announced by her as the oldest “human” footprints commandeered by Donald Johanson and Tim White announcing and naming them for themselves before Leakey’s session as representing the ape Australopithecus afarensis prompting 35 years of evolution fantasy taught as fact and now well-proved false. We at the Pleistocene Coalition have worked for the past eight years to help raise the integrity bar in anthropology and similarly-affected fields like biology and paleontology.

PCN #47 (Cerutti) was one of our most responded-to issues. A few of our readers’ responses were published in the kudos section of PCN #48 (also including responses to earlier issues). Two things readers did not expect in that issue were an “insider” perspective on why anthropologists might cower away from publishing controversial sites as well as a detailed side-by-side chart comparing many omitted facts of the Cerutti Mastodon Site publication history with what was published in the ‘peer-reviewed’ journal Nature (in two articles) and on the San Diego Natural History Museum website. The Pleistocene Coalition’s Timeline on the Cerutti Site filled in both historical gaps and proper commensurate citations missing in the politicized reports (50 years of Valsequillo omissions is enough). The two PCN articles showed how anthropology works behind-the-scenes to control public beliefs about human prehistory. It continually works through suppression and omission of facts; and the public has a right to know. The field was long ago exposed for misconduct in its ‘peer review’ system.

Regarding the Cerutti Mastodon Site publication in Nature being decades after its discovery Hardaker explained that American archaeologists are typically afraid to publish evidence that does not align with the political notion of no-early-humans in the Americas. What the side-by-side Pleistocene Coalition/ Cerutti Mastodon Timeline shows is that it took PC’s Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre and repeated reminders in PCN keeping the site in the news as a “suppressed” site (i.e. 25 years) that helped bring it out—including denials in print that the site was suppressed (see PCN #3, Jan-Feb 2010, In their own words: Caltrans site). Steen-McIntyre had already begun telling researchers about the site in the 1990s realizing even then it was not going to be published. Hardaker followed up as an “insider” saying not to expect any changes on the Cerutti (Caltrans) Site to be published referring to Steen-McIntyre’s report (PCN #7, Sept-Oct 2010, First Anniversary Issue, The abomination of Calico, part two). The most important misinformation in the Nature articles and the SD Timeline was declaring the Cerutti Site “to their knowledge” as the “oldest in situ, well-documented archaeological site in North America” (Steen-McIntyre, Thoughts on early man, PCN #47, May-June 2017). This, of course, is not even close to being true and 50 years of Valsequillo suppression and denigration doesn’t make it true. --jf
Thouhts on the geochronology at Hueyatlaco
How solid geochronology got trashed

By Charles W. Naeser (deceased), PhD, geologist, chemist, USGS

"I have been involved with the development and application of fission-track (FT) dating in the geological sciences for over 45 years. The ages I determined at the Hueyatlaco site were 370 ± 200 ka (uncertainty ± 2 standard deviations) on the Hueyatlaco ash and 600 ± 340 ka on pumice in the overlying Tetela brown mud."

The geochronological studies (uranium series, fission-track analysis, hydration of glass, and mineral etching) at the Hueyatlaco site in the Valasequillo region of central Mexico are on a solid foundation, but over the years, they have been questioned and dismissed on theoretical grounds. Yet when new tests are run, with both old and new techniques, the ages reported over 35 years ago have been confirmed.

I have been involved with the development and application of fission-track (FT) dating in the geological sciences for over 45 years (see Fig. 1 on the following page). The ages I determined at the Hueyatlaco site were 370 ± 200 ka (uncertainty ± 2 standard deviations) on the Hueyatlaco ash and 600 ± 340 ka on pumice in the overlying Tetela brown mud (Steen-McIntyre et al., 1981).

Within analytical uncertainty, typically large on young FT ages, these two ages are concordant. What I find confusing is that these ages have not been questioned on analytical grounds or the background of the technique, but because they are "too old" and don’t fit into the reigning paradigm.

My FT ages were determined just before the Geological Society of America Annual Meeting in Dallas in 1973 and were most likely reported, along with Szabo et al.’s (1969) uranium-series (U-series) age from an underlying bone and artifact bed at Hueyatlaco (see below), as part of Steen-McIntyre et al.’s (1973) talk. Since that time, there have been three negative comments in the literature regarding them. The first was by Cynthia Irwin-Williams at the 1973 GSA meeting (reported in Geology, 1974, v. 2, n. 2, p. 77), the second in an article by González et al. (2006), and the third in a book by Meltzer (2009).

By 1973, the FT dating of zircon from volcanic deposits was well established. I was therefore surprised by the following quote regarding Cynthia Irwin-Williams’ 1973 comments:

Cynthia Irwin-Williams, who did the original archeologic work, believes that such a great age is virtually impossible, and that sources of error must be sought in the dating methods.

From then until 2006, my Hueyatlaco FT ages were essentially ignored—I am not aware of any mention of the ages in the literature, and I was never contacted about them.

In 2006, González et al. published a paper that described impressions in the Xalnene Tuff that they attributed to human footprints. They had determined an OSL (optically stimulated luminescence) age of about 40,000 years for the tuff. At Hueyatlaco the Xalnene Tuff (indurated volcanic ash) underlies the Hueyatlaco ash that I had dated many years before. It also underlies the bone and artifact beds that contained the pelvis of a butchered camel dated by Szabo et al. (1969) using the U-series method. Szabo et al. (1969) also dated a tooth fragment from a butchered mastodon found at nearby El Horno. Both the FT and U-series dating suggested ages greater than 200,000 years for the ash and bone beds. Similarly, the comparative dating techniques of mineral etching and tephra hydration at Hueyatlaco (Steen-McIntyre et al., 1981) point to an older age. And VanLandingham (2004) reported that some of the diatom species found in and overlying the artifact beds at Hueyatlaco were extinct by the end of the Sangamon (80,000 years ago), indicating that they must be older than 80,000 yr.

So for their younger age (about 40,000 years) to be accepted, González et al. (2006) had to discredit the ages determined for the beds at Hueyatlaco by five
very different dating methods. González et al. (2006, p. 616-617) made the following statement regarding the U-series ages specifically and the other age estimates by association:

However, the dates need to be considered with caution because spuriously old Uranium Series dates are often encountered in bone from situations where the more mobile uranium is leached, increasing the apparent \( ^{230}\text{Th}/^{234}\text{U} \) and a priori assumptions of uranium uptake, such as the ‘early uptake’ model employed at the time to date the Tetela peninsula bones, do not identify, or account for, leaching or recent uptake. They have been shown to be unreliable and potentially are likely to give Uranium Series dates grossly in error (Pike et al., 2002). The large error ranges and the absence of other archaeological sites with similar antiquity within the Americas has led to these very old dates being rejected by the majority of archaeologists and paleontologists.

González et al. (2006) provide no data to specifically refute Szabo et al.’s (1969) U-series ages; they just reject them. They suggest that the older megafossil remains and extinct diatoms had been reworked into younger beds from older beds. This is highly unlikely to be true of the fossils in the bone beds at Hueyatlaco, which contain many articulated skeletons, including one yielding the camel pelvis dated by Szabo et al. (1969). Bones are highly unlikely to remain articulated during redeposition. This would be especially true in the high current environment necessary to transport large animal bones. VanLandingham (2004) presents evidence precluding reworking of the diatoms. There is no discussion in González et al. (2006) of the ages determined by FT, mineral etching, and tephra hydration—the results were thrown out without any discussion or justification.

At about the same time, however, Renne et al. (2005) reported an \(^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar} \) age of 1.3 ± 0.03 Ma for the Xalnene Tuff. In 2010, Mark et al. reported a second \(^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar} \) age for the Xalnene Tuff of 1.28 ± 0.04 Ma. With the age of the Xalnene Tuff established at about 1.3 Ma, not 40,000 years, the previously rejected geochronological data (isotopic, paleontologic, and comparative) are consistent with the stratigraphy and the geology.

New geochronological data on samples of the Hueyatlaco ash further support the antiquity of the Hueyatlaco site. In 1997, a new study was begun at Hueyatlaco under the sponsorship of M. Payn. As part of this study a new sample of the Hueyatlaco ash was collected. Zircon splits from this sample were sent to Ray Donelick for FT analysis and to Ken Farley for U-Th/He analysis. Donelick and Farley reported the following new ages to M. Payn (M. Payn, pers. comm. 2011): 212 ±94 ka and 250 ± 104 ka (FT, ± 2 standard deviations) and 413 to 505 ka and 406 to 504 ka (U-Th/He, probable age range). In summary, all of the geologic dating studies—now by six different isotopic, paleontologic, and comparative dating methods—place the age of the Hueyatlaco ash and underlying bone and artifact beds at between 80 ka and about 500 ka.

But in 2009, Meltzer (p. 106) still leaves the im-
The geochronology at Hueyatlaco (cont.)

“...The conflicts between the geology and archaeology in the Hueyatlaco region must reside somewhere other than the dating.”

Pression that the early geochronology of the “lower layer” at Hueyatlaco is suspect:

Geologists had dated that lower layer at 250,000-600,000 years old, based on the then-experimental techniques of uranium-series, fission-track, and tephrahydration dating. However, the archaeologist excavating the site put that layer at just 9,000-22,000 years old, based on results from radiocarbon dating of mollusk shells contained within it. ...Hueyatlaco was a poster child for problems that occur when different dating techniques, especially still-unproven ones, cannot be reconciled.

In fact, the radiocarbon ages referred to by Meltzer were determined on different, younger beds at a different site. The bone and artifact deposits at Hueyatlaco were first dated by Szabo et al. (1969) using U-series dating because no datable carbon could be found in the beds. The radiocarbon ages on mollusks were obtained from younger bone beds associated with an artifact at Barranca de Caulapan, 5 km away from Hueyatlaco. Szabo et al. (1969) using U-series dating obtained ages on bones from the Barranca de Caulapan site similar to the 14C ages, approximately 22,000 years.

Furthermore, at the time this work was undertaken, certainly the fission-track and tephra hydration techniques were relatively new, but they were far from “experimental” or “unproven.” Fission-track dating of tephas was well established in the geological literature.

Discrediting all of the older ages at Hueyatlaco would require a very convoluted series of events, rather than a simple, straightforward sequence of events beginning with deposition of the bone beds along with tools of probable human origin, followed by the beds being covered by lake sediments, and the deposition of the Hueyatlaco ash and younger sediments. The conflicts between the geology and archaeology in the Hueyatlaco region must reside somewhere other than the dating.
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Charles W. Naeser, PhD, is a geologist with hundreds of peer-reviewed publications to his credit. He did seminal work in the development and application of fission track dating of apatite, sphene, zircon, and epidote, and had a distinguished career with the United States Geological Survey. Naeser has had no difficulty getting any of his work published except when running up against the anthropological community which could not accept the hard science or dates for an extremely old age for Hueyatlaco early man site.
Hand-axes dredged up onto North Essex beach and who might have made them, Part 2

By Richard Dullum and Kevin Lynch

"I have asked every

Eds. Note: This article contains reference to an ancient skeleton discovered by James Reid-Moir in 1911 and is not to be confused with a more recently discovered skeleton called by the same name.


Regarding the possibility of ‘modern humans’ in Plio-Pleistocene Britain (e.g., hundreds of thousands of years ago), I had a very interesting online conversation with palaeoanthropologist Erik Trinkaus. The subject was the significance of a tibia bone (the larger bone of the lower leg or the shinbone) without an anterior crest. Here are some excerpts beginning with my question to Dr. Trinkaus:

"Dear Dr. Trinkaus,

The question I have for you is this: Are there any hominids, including H. neanderthalensis that do not exhibit an anterior crest on their tibiae? With the tibia presenting a smoothly curved anterior surface along its entire length. Cross-sections show a somewhat more thickish than modern bone.

I have asked every single orthopedic surgeon I’ve run into, and I’ve seen a lot over 35 years, nobody has ever heard of this. Have you?"

Here is Dr. Trinkaus’ response:

Sent: Fri, Mar 31, 2017 11:37 am
Subject: Re: postcranial H. neandertalisn
From: Trinkaus, Erik 〈trinkaus@wustl.edu〉

“They all have the normal human pattern of a muscle line for the anterior edge of the tibial anterior origin, but pre-modern human tibiae tend to have a more rounded anterior margin and a reduced or absent anterolateral sulcus between the anterior crest and the interosseus line. But a long time ago (1930s, I believe) Hrdlicka documented the range of variation of tibia cross-sectional shapes, and all of these fossil human tibiae fall well within his variation types. Erik Trinkaus.”

I then took the opportunity to ask him the same question I had earlier asked palaeoanthropologist Rick Potts:

"Thank you very much indeed for your answer to my question. I wasn’t able to find Hrdlicka’s documents on pre-modern tibiae, but I’ll keep looking. Very kind of you. I have a drawing of the mid-shaft cross-section of this tibia, done by the eminent Sir Arthur Keith that I could show you, if you’re interested [I did send it to him]. ..."

I’m also intrigued by a report out of Africa in PNAS online, Dec. 2013, Carol Ward and her team at Kaitlo, West Turkana, Kenya, found a human 3rd metatarsal in volcanic tuff dated at 1.42MyrBP. This bone matched modern human down to the proximal styloid process. With that find, how can modern man be excluded as the entity that left it? I asked this question of Rick Potts, Smithsonian curator and head of their traveling exhibition “Exploring Human Origins,” when it came to town last year [PCN readers see, Smithsonian challenged at traveling exhibit “Exploring Human Origins,” PCN #41, May-June 2016]. He knew right away the bone I was asking about, saying first that it was more robust than modern and that many Homo erectus fossils and implements had been found, no modern stuff in the area. He didn’t really say how modern presence could be excluded, only that in his opinion it was from Homo erectus. But, really, if you find a bone with a modern marker (Neanderthals also had the styloid process), doesn’t that mean in the absence of any Homo erectus hand skeletons showing their styloids a modern person had to have left it? Certainly, modern human presence cannot be excluded as a possibility.

Ward’s team isn’t the only one that has found modern human remains in the area. Manuel Domingo-Rodriguez et al found a modern human 5th phalanx in tuff dating to 1.95 million years old, at least, and other researchers have found modern human footprints at 1.5 million years old in the same area.

It seems to me that there are indications—strong indications—that modern human presence is likely far older than we had first thought possible.

Dr. Trinkaus’ reply was somewhat cryptic and off the track of my question:

From: Trinkaus, Erik
Sent: Mon, Apr 3, 2017 2:42 pm
Subject: Re: postcranial H. neanderthalensis

“Just because some part of the skeleton looks just like those of modern humans, that does not mean that the whole biology was ‘modern.’ Evolution is mosaic.”

My reply to that was:

“You didn’t answer the question, though that statement may be so I still don’t see how this ‘excludes’ a modern human from having left the finger bone as a possibility. Evolution aside, I’m talking about treatment and evaluation of evidence in a scientific investigation. How is the

> Cont. on page 11
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“"But, really, if you find a bone with a modern marker (Neander thals also had the styloid process), doesn’t that—in the absence of any Homo erectus hand skeletons showing their styloids—mean a modern person had to have left it?”

possibility excluded? and thanks for responding, it’s a real pleasure..... R.D” No reply was received.

The foregoing correspondence with Dr. Trinkaus is probably very typical of how the mainstream dodges challenges against human evolution. I thought the good professor was being cryptic, but apparently he believes in ‘modular’ evolution* which can paste over a lot of gaping holes in human evolutionary theory. This particular dodge is really a theory put forth by Stephen Jay Gould that different body parts can evolve at different rates. No evidence exists showing that this can happen.

The place where Ipswich Man was found buried, at the interface of the glacial mudflow from the Anglian Glaciation, ending in 450,000 years ago, with the ancient land surface sheared and rolled up into the mud, which existed frozen until then. The ancient land surface would have been laid down in late Pliocene to Early Pleistocene times and would have been habitable until at least 850,000 years ago, when boreal conditions were proven to have existed at the Happisburgh location. Happisburgh was recently excavated by Parfitt et al.

So Trinkaus has ruled out really that Ipswich man could have been of the modern type. We thought you might find it interesting that a well-respected anthropologist has upheld that Ipswich Man could be a Tertiary human being of a previously unknown type, since he has ruled out any other known human type!! I have researched whether a round anterior tibia (crestless) is known in modern humans as some kind of birth defect or medical or pathological condition. There is totally nothing there. It’s unknown in our time or any other time. If this condition was pathological for Ipswich Man, how did he live to be in his forties, and grow to 5’10”?

I do think that lack of a Tibial crest, even lack of an interosseous line, no less, implies greater age than has thus far been established for the hominid line. That is, if you follow the principle that Trinkaus credits to Ales Hrdlicka, an eminent 20th Century paleontologist and anatomist at the Smithsonian, the center of many “early man” discoveries and interpretations. According to Trinkaus, Hrdlicka studied all the bones of “early man” specimens available at the time, and did classify tibiae. I was unable to find this work, but Trinkaus did share with me the idea or principle that Hrdlicka established with regard to the anterior tibial crest; he said it diminished with evolutionary distance from modern man. This, by Hrdlicka’s definition, rules out Roman, or any other hominid discovered thus far, as being the anatomical type of Ipswich Man. By exclusion, Trinkaus has proven the skeleton can’t be from any age of man-like beings.

Some thoughts about bones and their ‘evolution’

In the case of evidence of a modern human hand from the Ward 2013 discovery in Kaitoi, West Turkana, Kenya, at 1.42 million years old, does evolution stop at modern human anatomical configurations, like hands and feet, then work on the head and brain? Does that idea have any footing in modern biology? The former question implies that a plan is somehow involved, even if it’s obviously unlikely there ever was a creature with a man’s body and essentially an ape head and brain. Yet attributing a modern hand to the standard image of Homo erectus as an ape-man does just that.

As covered in PCN, the idea that Australopithecine apes made the Laetoli footprints was started by Donald Johanson to promote his theories about australopithecines, and not by their discoverer Mary Leakey. Leakey regarded them as the oldest “human” footprints. since they were in proven 3.5 million year old strata, which would make the contrast even greater!

I know I must have made this point before: speaking of evolution’s driver. What, in ‘Natural Selection,’ would drive the creation of a non-tool-making, ape-brained and ape-headed, human-footed and modern-handed chimera?

Do we see anything like this process, anywhere on Earth, now or in the fossil record? Only in human evolution are we expected to accept this ‘mosaic’ or ‘modular’ process without a scrap of proof!

I would also like to highlight a recently acquired talent to our team, that of Kevin Lynch’s restoration of a cast of the famous “Broken Hill Man” or Kabwe skull, discovered in Rhodesia in 300,000-year old sediments (Fig. 1). Broken Hill Man’s brain capacity was near modern, and, he compares well with Moroccan Man, of 350,000-year old provenance and recently declared Homo sapiens:

Above, you can see that this skull might have a bit of a bun in the posterior, but it needs to really be felt, as Kevin found out on the Kabwe cast. Also, there’s no lower jaw to the Kabwe skull, but it might have resembled that of Moroccan Man (Fig. 2 following page) with no chin to speak of, i.e. prognathic like some Neanderthals.

With this new skill Kevin has demonstrated, I feel pretty

> Cont. on page 12
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fig. 2. Reconstruction of Moroccan Man H sapiens skull dated c. 315,000-years old. Image: Philipp Gunz, Max Planck Institute.

What, in 'Natural Selection,' would drive the creation of a non-tool-making, ape-brained and ape-headed, human-footed and modern-handed chimera?

"What, in 'Natural Selection,' would drive the creation of a non-tool-making, ape-brained and ape-headed, human-footed and modern-handed chimera?

Trained anatomical specialist that's ever examined them, by the fact they lay on the sandy side of the grave. The chalky bones are frozen in a resin cast as they were extracted en bloc so they have lain somewhat protected for over a century. We have photos of the skeleton in our previous articles (e.g., see PCN #31, September-October 2014) and have no reason to believe that any further study would be denied, if it was of a non-invasive nature, such as a CT scan. There's no question any attempt to remove the cast and matrix from the bones would result in their destruction, so this method is the only one which makes sense and could yield some useful anatomical information about this disregarded find of a century.
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Up from ‘arrahead’ hunter
By David Campbell

"Good information, David, and a lovely writing style. Believe it should be included in Issue 49, our anniversary issue, just about verbatim. –VSM"

"I think Virginia was ahead of her time when she wrote that article. I’m glad she’s still around to see her vision approaching fruition as she continues to work toward its full manifestation."

On 8/18/17 5:15 PM, David Campbell wrote:

John,

I’d meant to send you a comment earlier about the note added to Layout 2, about putting the profession on the kudos section [PCN #48, July-August 2017]. Yes, I’m all for it because it lets readers know that people in the professional community approve of what we are doing. The variety of professions represented indicates that we have a broad appeal across the spectrum of sciences.

Apparently several people in the Texas archaeological community share Virginia’s views in the reprint of the avocational article [PCN #48, July-August 2017]. Just recently, a group of them has begun to make YouTube presentations as part of the public outreach program. Previously, such outreach was limited to local seminars and workshops where the public was invited to bring in artifacts for identification and basic demonstrations. Instructions on flintknapping, methodology, and recording of data in an excavation were taught as well. I encouraged the YouTubers, telling them that Texas archaeology outreach had finally made it into the 21st century, reaching a much wider audience than local live events. This seemed appropriate as one of the video producers was an archaeologist who had conducted weekend sessions in his garage—processing material from the Gault site. Avocationalists were warmly welcomed, probably because it involved the more tedious aspects of archaeology such as screening, washing, sorting, labeling and dumping the debris left over (usually some volunteer’s driveway or garden). Had the weekend sessions not been in Austin some 300 miles away I would have been doing free grunt work every weekend.

The attitudes toward avocationalists have changed drastically since I joined TAS [Texas Archaeological Society] back in 2003. The sneering contempt toward “looters,” “potholers,” and “arrahead hunters” has toned down to a whisper now that various political visigoths have slashed funds for archaeology and preservation of sites to the bare bones. Knowledgeable avocationalists are now provided with long distance assistance in the form of professional advice, access to research materials and lab analysis. This while they toil for free in remote areas on their own with dedication equal to anybody with lots of letters following their monikers. The outreach video maker I mentioned earlier was among the tiny handful of professionals back then who treated me with respect and encouragement when I was labeled “dumber than a soap dish full of rocks” by the others. So I think Virginia was ahead of her time when she wrote that article. I’m glad she’s still around to see her vision approaching fruition as she continues to work toward its full manifestation.

Yours truly,
David Campbell"

The above email was from an interpersonal communication made between the editors of Pleistocene Coalition News during the final phases of layout for Issue #48. And just as Virginia suggested, I am presenting it here essentially verbatim. Writing an article for the Anniversary Issue places an additional burden of responsibility on all of us contributors because we wish to present our very best and with the uniformly excellent content of previous issues the bar is raised commensurately. Each issue is a tough act follow.

In addition to all the new relevant material that has come across our collective desk, there have been a number of personal obstacles placed in our path, not the least of which was the unexpected shocking news > Cont. on page 14
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of the death of founding member Chris Hardaker soon followed by the delayed news of Chuck Naeser’s demise several months ago. All the while, John, Virginia and I were contending with some major health issues. At times the prospect of putting together this issue seemed overwhelming. Then our longtime contributor Vesna Tenodi sent an encouraging message urging us to persevere in the face of adversity. It is here that I would like to thank her for the inspiration that made this article possible. This is more personal in tone than I generally write but the subject of avocational relations with the professional community is inherently personal in nature to those of us who have experienced it first hand.

Let us begin by considering the current definitions of avocation and amateur that are virtually synonymous. Both avocation and amateur are defined as activities that are subordinate to one’s vocation for which one receives no monetary reward. Both are activities one does due to a strong inclination to do them and amateur is literally derived from the love of doing something. Both are equated with hobby, which has a connotation of a trivial pursuit. By contrast the word vocation is defined as a summons or strong inclination to a course of action even to the point of being a divine summons. Most avocationalists will tell you that they received such a summons early in life with no expectation of material reward. Similarly many vocational archaeologists will tell you that they received their summons early in life sacrificing much in the way of material gain to follow it. To me there seems to be little real distinction between the terms and often one segues into the other. I recall a comment from an archaeologist at a dig in which I participated: “We all started out as pot hokers.”

This is true of many of the pioneering archaeologists I’ve come to admire over the years such as Cyrus Ray, King Harris, Wilson Crook II, Earnest Adams and Uncle Bill Baker. All of them by dint of perseverance, self education, and significant discoveries came to be well regarded by the credentialed professional community as peers. At what point did the dedicated amateur come to be excluded and even reviled as “looters, pot hokers and arrahead hunters” by the credentialed elite?

It’s hard to put an exact date on it but as late as the 50s King Harris was joined by groups of dedicated amateur scouring the sweltering bottomlands of the Trinity drainage mapping out the lost prehistory of Texas. During rest breaks, Harris would informally educate his companions on the finer points of methodology and current anthropological theory. As a result many of them went on to achieve expertise that garnered them citations in professional literature. Today this would be termed “public outreach.” However, public outreach was all but abandoned during a long hiatus in which amateurs were shunned and discoveries and reports were sequestered in the gray literature and collections inaccessible to the general public. This is well illustrated by revelations in an article titled, “More than 50 million artifacts from Texas’ past kept at UT lab: Texas Archeological Research Laboratory is a museum that is not a museum at all.” The article is in a recent issue of the Austin American-Statesman available online at:

http://www.mystatesman.com/entertainment/more-than-million-artifacts-from-texas-past-kept-lab/x3ykMMHpD7wb250ElJ1/

It is interesting to note that this article is filed under the category of “entertainment” cultivating a public perception that the entire discipline of archaeology is merely another trivial pursuit equivalent to movie, concert, and video game reviews. However, as noted in my opening message, the situation is taking a turn for the better as a new generation of professionals takes the helm realizing the value of avocationalists in the progress of advancing archaeological knowledge and correcting old errors. Clark Wernecke recently published an article in the Journal of Archaeology and Education highlighting this issue to his peers. Clark was among the few who accepted my contributions of artifact photos and information relating to his project at the Texas Gault site without condescending along with Andrew Malof and Michael Collins who were likewise major participants at that site. Ironically, the Gault site was brought to professional attention by an “arrahead hunter” bringing in Clovis points and inscribed plaques from what was then a pay to dig site that had been known for forty years. That man is seldom credited by name. Such behavior has added to the way of material gain to follow it. To me there seems to be little real distinction between the terms and often one segues into the other. I recall a comment from an archaeologist at a dig in which I participated: “We all started out as pot hokers.”

This is true of many of the pioneering archaeologists I’ve come to admire over the years such as Cyrus Ray, King Harris, Wilson Crook II, Earnest Adams and Uncle Bill Baker. All of them by dint of perseverance, self education, and significant discoveries came to be well regarded by the credentialed professional community as peers. At what point did the dedicated amateur come to be excluded and even reviled as “looters, pot hokers and arrahead hunters” by the credentialed elite?

It’s hard to put an exact date on it but as late as the 50s King Harris was joined by groups of dedicated amateurs scouring the sweltering bottomlands of the Trinity drainage mapping out the lost prehistory of Texas. During rest breaks, Harris would informally educate his companions on the finer points of methodology and current anthropological theory. As a result many of them went on to achieve expertise that garnered them citations in professional literature. Today this would be termed “public outreach.” However, public outreach was all but abandoned during a long hiatus in which amateurs were shunned and discoveries and reports were sequestered in the gray literature and collections inaccessible to the general public. This is well illustrated by revelations in an article titled, “More than 50 million artifacts from Texas’ past kept at UT lab: Texas Archeological Research Laboratory is a museum that is not a museum at all.” The article is in a recent issue of the Austin American-Statesman available online at:

http://www.mystatesman.com/entertainment/more-than-million-artifacts-from-texas-past-kept-lab/x3ykMMHpD7wb250ElJ1/

It is interesting to note that this article is filed under the category of “entertainment” cultivating a public perception that the entire discipline of archaeology is merely another trivial pursuit equivalent to movie, concert, and video game reviews. However, as noted in my opening message, the situation is taking a turn for the better as a new generation of professionals takes the helm realizing the value of avocationalists in the progress of advancing archaeological knowledge and correcting old errors. Clark Wernecke recently published an article in the Journal of Archaeology and Education highlighting this issue to his peers. Clark was among the few who accepted my contributions of artifact photos and information relating to his project at the Texas Gault site without condescending along with Andrew Malof and Michael Collins who were likewise major participants at that site. Ironically, the Gault site was brought to professional attention by an “arrahead hunter” bringing in Clovis points and inscribed plaques from what was then a pay to dig site that had been known for forty years. That man is seldom credited by name. Such behavior has added to the way of material gain to follow it. To me there seems to be little real distinction between the terms and often one segues into the other. I recall a comment from an archaeologist at a dig in which I participated: “We all started out as pot hokers.”

This is true of many of the pioneering archaeologists I’ve come to admire over the years such as Cyrus Ray, King Harris, Wilson Crook II, Earnest Adams and Uncle Bill Baker. All of them by dint of perseverance, self education, and significant discoveries came to be well regarded by the credentialed professional community as peers. At what point did the dedicated amateur come to be excluded and even reviled as “looters, pot hokers and arrahead hunters” by the credentialed elite?

It’s hard to put an exact date on it but as late as the 50s King Harris was joined by groups of dedicated amateurs scouring the sweltering bottomlands of the Trinity drainage mapping out the lost prehistory of Texas. During rest breaks, Harris would informally educate his companions on the finer points of methodology and current anthropological theory. As a result many of them went on to achieve expertise that garnered them citations in professional literature. Today this would be termed “public outreach.” However, public outreach was all but abandoned during a long hiatus in which amateurs were shunned and discoveries and reports were sequestered in the gray literature and collections inaccessible to the general public. This is well illustrated by revelations in an article titled, “More than 50 million artifacts from Texas’ past kept at UT lab: Texas Archeological Research Laboratory is a museum that is not a museum at all.” The article is in a recent issue of the Austin American-Statesman available online at:

http://www.mystatesman.com/entertainment/more-than-million-artifacts-from-texas-past-kept-lab/x3ykMMHpD7wb250ElJ1/

It is interesting to note that this article is filed under the category of “entertainment” cultivating a public perception that the entire discipline of archaeology is merely another trivial pursuit equivalent to movie, concert, and video game reviews. However, as noted in my opening message, the situation is taking a turn for the better as a new generation of professionals takes the helm realizing the value of avocationalists in the progress of advancing archaeological knowledge and correcting old errors. Clark Wernecke recently published an article in the Journal of Archaeology and Education highlighting this issue to his peers. Clark was among the few who accepted my contributions of artifact photos and information relating to his project at the Texas Gault site without condescending along with Andrew Malof and Michael Collins who were likewise major participants at that site. Ironically, the Gault site was brought to professional attention by an “arrahead hunter” bringing in Clovis points and inscribed plaques from what was then a pay to dig site that had been known for forty years. That man is seldom credited by name. Such behavior has added to the way of material gain to follow it. To me there seems to be little real distinction between the terms and often one segues into the other. I recall a comment from an archaeologist at a dig in which I participated: “We all started out as pot hokers.”

This is true of many of the pioneering archaeologists I’ve come to admire over the years such as Cyrus Ray, King Harris, Wilson Crook II, Earnest Adams and Uncle Bill Baker. All of them by dint of perseverance, self education, and significant discoveries came to be well regarded by the credentialed professional community as peers. At what point did the dedicated amateur come to be excluded and even reviled as “looters, pot hokers and arrahead hunters” by the credentialed elite?

It’s hard to put an exact date on it but as late as the 50s King Harris was joined by groups of dedicated amateurs scouring the sweltering bottomlands of the Trinity drainage mapping out the lost prehistory of Texas. During rest breaks, Harris would informally educate his companions on the finer points of methodology and current anthropological theory. As a result many of them went on to achieve expertise that garnered them citations in professional literature. Today this would be termed “public outreach.” However, public outreach was all but abandoned during a long hiatus in which amateurs were shunned and discoveries and reports were sequestered in the gray literature and collections inaccessible to the general public. This is well illustrated by revelations in an article titled, “More than 50 million artifacts from Texas’ past kept at UT lab: Texas Archeological Research Laboratory is a museum that is not a museum at all.” The article is in a recent issue of the Austin American-Statesman available online at:

http://www.mystatesman.com/entertainment/more-than-million-artifacts-from-texas-past-kept-lab/x3ykMMHpD7wb250ElJ1/

It is interesting to note that this article is filed under the category of “entertainment” cultivating a public perception that the entire discipline of archaeology is merely another trivial pursuit equivalent to movie, concert, and video game reviews. However, as noted in my opening message, the situation is taking a turn for the better as a new generation of professionals takes the helm realizing the value of avocationalists in the progress of advancing archaeological knowledge and correcting old errors. Clark Wernecke recently published an article in the Journal of Archaeology and Education highlighting this issue to his peers. Clark was among the few who accepted my contributions of artifact photos and information relating to his project at the Texas Gault site without condescending along with Andrew Malof and Michael Collins who were likewise major participants at that site. Ironically, the Gault site was brought to professional attention by an “arrahead hunter” bringing in Clovis points and inscribed plaques from what was then a pay to dig site that had been known for forty years. That man is seldom credited by name. Such behavior has added to...
the adversarial attitude that has been mirrored by the avocationalists. I was bluntly reminded of this a few years ago when I made copies of David Meltzer’s Fluted Point Survey and attempted to contact collectors in my area with extensive fluted point collection. All refused contact that would have divulged invaluable information and documentation. Upon reflection I could see their point of view and made no further efforts. Yet there must be a détente between us in order to form a more perfect union.

Another series of papers made accessible to me from behind JSTOR pay walls, were written by Arkansas archaeologist Juliet Morrow. In these she not only challenged the Clovis Myth but validated the importance of avocationalists and surface finds in creating a new model for Clovis. In her words I heard echoes of Chris:

“A theory is a model that has been elevated to a ‘near truth’ based upon the abundance of evidence. Science aims to eliminate models and theories that don’t account for the available evidence. Scientific models and, in turn, theories, are built on evidence. If there is no evidence, then we are not in the realm of science. We may as well be telling stories to each other, and that’s ok—storytelling is part of human nature—but it’s not science.”

Juliet goes on to say that bad evidence must be discarded and that archaeologists spend a great deal of time and ink discarding bad evidence. But bad evidence has come to include uncertainty and a lot of evidence is discarded if there is a hint of uncertainty, which is inherent in surface finds, one-off finds and out-of-context finds. However if good new evidence is to be found, someone must search for it. This is where the avocational becomes the eyes of the archaeologist bent over a desk busy discarding evidence, answering questions about artifacts and filing site reports. Uncertain evidence is not in and of itself bad evidence and it becomes less uncertain if accurate reporting is made. That is the challenge the avocational must meet.
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Copy editor Tom Baldwin adds the following enlightening note regarding avocational archaeologists and Calico Early Man Site in the Mojave Desert, near Barstow, California: The Friends of Calico (a group consisting primarily of amateurs) kept that site open for years after the deaths of Leakey and Simpson. It only fell apart after the death of Simpson when the “professionals” circled like vultures due to Simpson endowing the Friends with something close to half a million dollars.
Oral tradition and beyond, Part 2

By Ray Urbaniak, Engineer, rock art researcher, and preservationist

In Part 1, I mentioned that each time I have seen sweeping antelope horns in rock art or in photos it has stirred a primal feeling inside me which goes beyond my "logical" brain (Oral tradition and beyond, PCN #47, May-June 2017). After putting the experience into those terms, I was curious if I could be more specific instead of just vaguely explaining it as "genetic memory." It was then that I considered the possibility that these particularly-shaped horns might represent the Fibonacci spiral sequence. So I tested the idea with superimpositions as in Figs. 1–2. They show at least one of the quarter circle sections suggesting the spiral.

I was pleasantly surprised to find that these particular horns that resonated with me and other humans do suggest the spiral.

The following description from a University of Georgia math page explains the idea’s direction:

"The Fibonacci numbers are Nature’s numbering system. They appear everywhere in Nature, from the leaf arrangement in plants, to the pattern of the florets of a flower, the bracts of a pinecone, or the scales of a pineapple. The Fibonacci numbers are therefore applicable to the growth of every living thing, including a single cell, a grain of wheat, a hive of bees, and even all of mankind" (Fibonacci in Nature, Nikhat Parveen, UGA).

In photos I have seen sweeping antelope horns had upon me I thought I would check them for the Fibonacci spiral sequence. I superimposed the spiral on the image of a modern antelope and posed the spiral on the image of a Utah petroglyph as shown. Note: There are many other near identical petroglyphs which show the exact same sweep showing at least one circular portion of the Fibonacci spiral. Images: Living antelope and Fibonacci spirals; Wikimedia Commons. Petroglyph photo: Ray Urbaniak.
Support from the *Phi in the Acheulian* paper for proposed emotion-affecting Fibonacci-style horns

By John Feliks

Ray Urbaniak’s boundary-stretching ideas about Southwest U.S. petroglyphs published in *PCN* since 2013 have come under attack in recent years by the very Session editor (and associates) who attempted to censor both of *PCN* Layout editor’s back-to-back XV UISPP Congress presentations in Lisbon, 2006. After the presentations, which turned out to be better received than they had anticipated, the two Session editors involved and associates may be important, as the cerebellum is now understood to play a role in human thought processes, including emotion.”

quickly—within one week of the Congress—began blocking the papers from publication deleting all mention of them in the appropriate conference reports making it appear as though the papers were never even presented and creating a problem with their 11 sponsors. Actions like these were part of what led to formation of the Pleistocene Coalition which brought together scientists and other researchers—including many PhDs of similar experience—in order to fight academic misconduct in anthropology. The field is well-known for such practices over decades in attempts to control what the public believes about Paleolithic peoples. As a reminder, *PCN* Layout editor was not the only presenter to whom this was attempted, as published prior. The editors did this on the claimed grounds that the geometry-based papers had “no scientific merit” and would ruin the author’s career if published, yet, scrambled to absorb the work including all geometric studies submitted, references, and supplementary materials via privileged access rapidly altering their own publications informed by the papers and then quickly publishing their own clearly-influenced papers but without proper citation. There is no place in science for academic practices like this. The Part 1/Part 2 papers were *The Graphics of Bilzingsleben* and *Phi in the Acheulian*.

The Part 2 paper which supports Ray Urbaniak’s idea in *Oral tradition and beyond*, Part 2 demonstrated that Phi, otherwise known as the golden ratio (1.618) and related to the Fibonacci sequence, could be found in the archaeological record of *Homo erectus* to a far greater degree than just its well-known presence in handaxes. Although the evidence centered around the 400,000-year old engraved bones from Bilzingsleben, Germany, the Turkana Boy *ergaster* skull was used to make a connection between the external world, cerebellum, and emotions in a section called Fractal Location of the Cerebellum (Figs. 1–3). The ideas were enthusiastically received in 2006 (after which a spate of similar ideas quickly began to flood the mainstream anthropology world). They support Urbaniak’s idea that the sweeping horns of various antelope suggesting the Fibonacci spiral can induce deep or even “primal” emotions.

“Fig. 1. Fig. 20 from *Phi in the Acheulian*, pp.25–28. Type *Homo erectus* or *ergaster* skull showing perfect affiliation with the golden spiral. The 1.6 million-year old Turkana Boy skull photo is from Alan Walker and Richard Leakey, 1993, “The Nariokotome *Homo erectus* skeleton,” Harvard University Press. Photo was faded and superimposed with permission."

"This may be important, as the cerebellum is now understood to play a role in human thought processes, including emotion.”

Fig. 2. Figure 21 from *Phi in the Acheulian*. Fractal location of the cerebellum: The golden mean within the modern human brain. The cerebellum (along with the medulla and pons) represents the “oldest part” of the brain. Cerebellum location is the same for *Homo erectus* (see Bruner 2004, “Geometric morphometrics and paleoneurology: brain shape evolution in the genus *Homo*.” (The MRI is public domain.)"

"Fig. 3. Fig.22 and caption from *Phi in the Acheulian*: Lower Palaeolithic intuition and the natural origins of analogy, Feliks 2006 (British Archaeological Reports International, 2008): Fractal location of the cerebellum: The golden mean within the *Homo erectus* skull and brain. The cerebellum is the part of the brain that “understands” the positioning of the finger joints [built to the phi ratio] in space. Every movement of the fingers, therefore, is an internal confirmation of the phi ratio. The oldest part of the brain tucks away in the whirls of a golden spiral. This may be important, as the cerebellum is now understood to play a role in human thought processes, including emotion, in addition to its long-known roles in motor function, balance, etc. i.e. the cerebellum is an agent genuinely capable of linking the "internal golden mean" to actions in the physical world by way of cognition."

*John Feliks* has specialized in the study of early human cognition for nearly 25 years.
Lost World found again
By Vesna Tenodi, MA archaeology; artist and writer

“Some of them perhaps truly believe that outrageous lies are ethical, culturally sensitive, and therefore justified.”

Consequences of political correctness
When my last article was published I was again attacked and abused for saying that some Australian archaeologists are making false claims, deliberately misrepresenting, or—in some cases—outright fabricating evidence to support their invented story of the “ancient culture” that never actually existed.

Even though a number of authors before me, even some Aboriginal people among them, who have had enough of this charade, noted the same thing and criticized the political correctness which forbids us to think and speak freely, I seem to have become a pet hate for some people who believe that filling academic papers with sentimental ramblings is a good idea.

Some of them perhaps truly believe that outrageous lies are ethical, culturally sensitive, and therefore justified.

I disagree. Deliberate deception with the intention to mislead and to harm anyone who objects to the ideological imperatives of the moment is neither ethical nor justifiable.

Political correctness and identity politics are reigning supreme in Australia and have led to an unimaginable loss of evidence, as well as to the unforgivable deliberate destruction of prehistoric human remains, and have rendered any independent research, especially genetic research, impossible.

I am happy to report that over the last few months, while reconnecting with my colleagues in Europe, in contrast to Australian practice, independent thought and independent research are supported and fiercely defended in most European countries. One highlight is that European scientists have found a way to investigate Australian prehistory as it should be investigated—following the evidence wherever it might lead. This involves the fact that there is a plethora of Australian samples collected and brought back by European explorers at the time when that was possible. So, even though Australia itself is destroying evidence much can be gleaned from that preserved in Europe.

Such artifacts and samples from Australia, guarded by European institutions, are used to compare prehistoric people, and are helping in mapping out various stone age migrations.

In contrast to the stagnant state of Australian archaeology, European archaeology is quite an exciting realm. This is especially so in countries such as Romania, Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey which have become hotspots for multinational teams of researchers.

For example, several months after discoveries of unusual fossil teeth in Greece and Bulgaria—dated at c. 7 million years old and interpreted by the mainstream as belonging to a “hominin ape” dubbed “El Graeco”—fossil footprints with remarkable human-like characteristics were found at Trachilos, Crete.

The footprints are estimated to be 5.7 million years old, a time equated with the end of the Miocene (Cosmos, September 2017). While there is, of course, no connection between the teeth and the footprints they each, nonetheless, represent exciting discoveries. The footprints, especially, being so old and depending on what further research turns up may have many profound implications.

Also, recent finds involving genetic research are changing the story of pre-history in many unexpected ways such as suggesting a remapping of various ancient human migration routes that were, until recently, believed to have unfolded during the Pleistocene and beyond.

The oldest North American sites
Although in the U.S. rather than Australia, another intriguing find recently published in the journal Nature (May 2017) after 25 years is calling for revision of American prehistory as the mainstream knows it. Implications of the site were first brought to public attention by PC founding member, Dr. Virginia Steen-McIntyre, as they were prior hidden away in a little-known government report since 1995 until she began drawing attention to them and published in PCN, January 2010. It is the Cerutti Mastodon Site in California now dated at 130,000 years old and which strongly suggests the presence of an unidentified species of Homo in the Americas during the last interglacial period. Formerly known as the Caltrans or National City Site until this year it has been kept in the public eye in many PCN articles since 2010. After the site’s publication...
Lost World found again (cont.)

"That is, to me, the most important role of the Pleistocene Coalition News—to inspire and encourage and show the way towards liberating ourselves from scholarly conditioning that threatens to kill any speck of imagination and to silence that inner voice that guides every seeker of truth towards a great discovery."

An important thing to mention especially here in our 8th Anniversary Issue is that even though Nature publication of the Cerutti Site is an exciting new development, contrary to claims in the articles, it is not the oldest in situ, well-documented archaeological site in North America as Virginia noted straight up in her Issue #47 article, Thoughts on early man (May-June 2017). That honor goes to the sites at the core of the Pleistocene Coalition and regularly published in PCN, namely, Valsequillo, Mexico, at 250,000 years old and Calico in southern California, at 200,000 years old. These facts need to be kept in order whatever one might read in mainstream journals. As editor David Campbell puts it, “Caltrans should take third place in the order of truly ancient sites in North America.”

Apart from Chris’ personal and professional connection to the discover of the Cerutti Mastodon Site, he played an immeasurably important and central role in helping to keep Valsequillo and Calico in the public eye as the oldest sites reported so far in North America.

Every such discovery can and should serve as yet another prompt to encourage us to rethink everything we were conditioned and/or trained to think, or forced to adopt as our own thoughts.

The lost world I am talking about is the world of independent scientific inquiry, of the freedom to think and voice our thoughts without fear of being attacked. And it can be found again, with groups of people who are willing to sacrifice a great deal in order to regain and help others regain their intellectual freedom, and to encourage people to seek the truth that can only be found through intellectual honesty—with people like our late friend Chris Hardaker.

That is, to me, the most important role of the Pleistocene Coalition News—to inspire and encourage and show the way towards liberating ourselves from scholarly conditioning that threatens to kill any speck of imagination and to silence that inner voice that guides every seeker of truth towards a great discovery.

As we mark the 8th anniversary of Pleistocene Coalition News, my congratulations to all the participants in this noble endeavour.

VESNA TENODI is an archaeologist, artist, and writer based in Sydney, Australia. She received her Master’s Degree in Archaeology from the University of Zagreb, Croatia. She also has a diploma in Fine Arts from the School of Applied Arts in Zagreb. Her Degree Thesis was focused on the spirituality of Neolithic man in Central Europe as evidenced in iconography and symbols in prehistoric cave art and pottery.

After migrating to Sydney, she worked for 25 years for the Australian Government, and ran her own business. Today she is an independent researcher and spiritual archaeologist, concentrating on the origins and meaning of pre-Aboriginal Australian rock art. In the process, she is developing a theory of the Pre-
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