One typically hears the claim that science is self-correcting. It’s a quality certainly true for sciences such as chemistry, physics, astronomy, geology, and mathematics. However, at PCN we have spent the past eight years providing evidence that the fields of anthropology, biology, and paleontology—those supposedly explaining the fossil record, human origins, and the Paleolithic past—are not only “not” self-correcting at the core of their central claims but are characterized by selective reporting of the facts. Major errors instead of prompting corrections prompt more and more convoluted claims about evolution and how Paleolithic people were not quite us. The fields have been unable to self-correct for the past 150 years promoting a myth of prehistory which is increasingly being imposed on the public as fact. This is being accomplished through concealing scientific errors and through the suppression of conflicting evidence. A while back, PC founding member, archaeologist Chris Hardaker suggested re-publishing earlier PCN articles with evidence anthropologists had suppressed then and still ignore today. We begin doing that in this issue with Virginia’s article from PCN #3, Jan-Feb 2010, regarding a 300,000-year-old mastodon butchering site discovered in California hidden away in an unccelebratory report and never presented to the public. Normally, discoveries as important as this make their way into publication quickly. Our goal to make suppressed evidence known is what inspired us to form the Pleistocene Coalition in 2009. We hope you enjoy Issue #45.

**After 22 years, Caltrans mastodon butchering site still being ignored**

“We agreed to wait and say nothing about it until the researchers and their colleagues made this exciting discovery public. That was fifteen years ago.”

—VSM, PCN#3, Jan-Feb 2010, regarding 300,000-year-old mastodon butchering site discovered in San Diego Co., California during highway development and hidden away in an unccelebratory report.

**Update**: It has now been 22 years since a 300,000-year old mastodon butchering site was discovered. However, to this date the evidence has not been brought to the public. See for our reprint of the article with additional figure.

**Review on statistical techniques and Paleolithic interpretation**

(see Campbell p. 6).

**Archaeologist and PC founding member, Chris Hardaker, begins an enlightening series comparing evidence from Valsequillo, Mexico, with comparable sites worldwide (see Hardaker p. 4).**

**Mainstream science continues to mislead the public regarding the abilities of Homo erectus and Neanderthal people in order to split prehistoric humanity into supposed evolutionary groups. This update on censored evidence demonstrates use of the straight edge 400,000 years ago. (see Feliks p. 9).**

**Political correctness technique while soundscaping ethical is increasingly being used as a means of manipulating science by withholding facts in order to promote ideas (see Tenodi p. 12).**

**Anyone suggesting the people who produced Paleolithic tools were less intelligent than us simply need to try making their own (see Lynch & Dullum p. 10).**

**Desert varnish and pavement effects on artifacts (Baldwin, upcoming).**
After 22 years, Caltrans mastodon butchering site still being ignored

By Virginia Steen-McIntyre, PhD, volcanic ash specialist

"Scientists describe an apparent mastodon butchering site some 300,000 years old..."

If an announcement was made to the media, the media have ignored it. A classic example of how data on an important but controversial archaeological site can get buried."

Following are quotes from an open-file report dated July 28, 1995, prepared for Caltrans (California Department of Transportation) District 11 and titled State Route 54, Paleontological Mitigation Program, Final Report.

In the report, scientists describe an apparent mastodon butchering site some 300,000 years old, uncovered during highway improvement work in San Diego County (Figs 1–3). Bones had originally been modified and moved around, rock cobbles had been split to form tools, and one tusk had been thrust vertically deep into the fine-grained sediment, apparently to mark the site.

I obtained copies of the report shortly after it was published (minus the full set of appendices) from two late colleagues, George Carter and Charles Repenning. We agreed to wait and say nothing about it until the researchers and their colleagues made this exciting discovery public. That was fifteen years ago. If an announcement was made to the media, the media have ignored it. A classic example of how data on an important but controversial archaeological site can get buried.

On page 51 of the copy sent to me by Charles Repenning is a hand-written note from him giving subsequent information about the site. I’ve reproduced it also, below.

Page 1, Executive Summary

"...The fragmentary skeletal remains of a single individ-

nal of the American Mastodon, Mammut americanum was collected from a quarry excavation. This quarry produced interesting and puzzling ta-

phonemic results. Radiometric dating of ivory and soil carbonate from the quarry yielded dates of 335+/-35Ka (thousands of years before present) and 196+/-15Ka respectively, late Pleistocene, Rancholabrean NALMA (North American Land Mammal Age). Other fossil mammals salvaged from the Pleistocene stream deposits included ground sloth, shrews, rodents, rabbits, wolf, camel, deer, and mammoth. Overall, the collecting localities and their contained fossil remains represent the most significant Pleistocene paleontological discoveries."

> Cont. on page 3
Caltrans Mastodon site still being ignored (cont.)

Fig. 3. Plan view of the Caltrans, 300,000-year old mastodon butchering site (Units D3 and E3 1 meter square in 10cm increments), 1995, from California Dept. Transp. report. It shows the concentrations of fossil bone and rock specimens.

We agreed to wait and say nothing about it until the researchers and their colleagues made this exciting discovery public. That was fifteen years ago.”

Fig. 4.5 - Plan of Units D3 and E3, Mastodon Quarry, showing concentration of fossil and rock specimens. Individual units measure 1 x 1 metres. Graduations within units every 10 cm. North is towards top of figure.

Pages 22, 32, Collecting Localities

...Mastodon Quarry

"...The mastodon material collected from Bed E consists of the right and left tusks, two molars, three vertebrae, 10 ribs, portions of both femurs, at least two phalanges, and numerous large and small bone fragments. The bone is moderately well-preserved with many elements found encased in calcium carbonate (caliche) nodules. Many bones were fragmentary and displayed distinct types of breakage. Of special note was the discovery of both isolated femur heads side-by-side, one with its articular surface up (#252) and one with its articular surface down (#258). Adjacent to the femur heads lay fragments of ribs, one of which (#253) was found lying directly on a plutonic cobble (#254). Also found in this concentration was a large piece of a long bone shaft displaying distinct spiral fracture.

Page 49, Conclusions

"The paleontological resource mitigation program conducted for SR 54 was successful in terms of the quantity and quality of recovered fossil remains. Prior to this project our knowledge of the Pleistocene vertebrates of coastal San Diego County was extremely limited. The discovery and documentation of 32 fossil collecting localities and recovery of hundreds of vertebrate and invertebrate fossil specimens represents a tremendous resource for future research projects including studies of systematics, paleoenvironments, biostratigraphy, and local sea level history. In addition, the fossils from SR54 represent an important educational resource in terms of their exhibition and academic value."

NOTE: There wasn’t ONE mention of the mastodon site in the Conclusions!

Hand-written note from paleontologist Charles Repenning, on page 51 of my copy of the report:

"Note 1. About 60 pages of appendices have been omitted in this copy. Many mammal fossil specimens found.

Note 2. Subsequent to this report three items of interest have happened.

A. I examined the fossil rodents—all microtines were correctly identified: a Microtus californicus (Irving) but one. It was an extinct species.

B. C14 ages became available—all infinite. [i.e. too old to measure by that method.]

C. Fragmented boulders (to make butchering tools) were fitted together to make complete boulders that SOMEBODY had carried to the site for that purpose."

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/

#virginia_steen_mcintyre
The impossible puzzles of Valsequillo

A review of intelligence and deeds of pre-Modern humans, Introduction

By Chris Hardaker, MA, archaeologist

The Valsequillo Reservoir, south of Mexico City, yielded an amazing series of discoveries during the 1960s, and has been covered in many previous issues of *PCN*. The focus of this series: to explore how its amazing out-of-place artifacts (OOPS)—both stone and bone tools as well as art objects—fit into the larger scheme of things in the Old World during pre-Modern times, 200,000 years ago plus.

For example, at the time of the discoveries, the stone tools (such as in Fig. 1) and art pieces would have been perfectly at home in the Old World Upper Paleolithic (UP) starting roughly 35–40,000 years ago. If discovered in Eurasia, the Valsequillo finds would have been regarded as an incredible UP assemblage; representational art etched into bone associated with sites providing an in-situ evolution of projectile point technology from simple retouched blades to a fully matured bifacial thinning and pressure flaking industry.

This was the world of archaeological Cynthia Irwin Williams. She had worked with the best in Europe. She learned and worked with the best in the States. She knew the archaeological terrain on both sides of the pond through the common language of stone technology: there are only so many ways to make an arrowhead. She knew them all. She knew what it took.

All of the Valsequillo sites were excavated and all artifacts were collected before the first 14C dates began to roll in. At first, CIW believed that maybe the dates would run at perhaps 13–15,000 years old, or slightly before Clovis (the long-believed earliest culture in the Americas). The first dates from a neighboring arroyo were around 22,000 years, and these produced goosebumps in the profession because they almost doubled that of Clovis culture. Still, there was room for doubt given the unclear association of the arroyo’s sediments to those containing the artifacts uncovered miles away at Hueyatla (most recent), Tecacaxco, El Mirador, and El Horno (oldest).

Mineralized bones cannot be dated with 14C. When uranium dates produced six-figure dates—i.e. over 200,000 years—the entire field went bananas, and eventually led to an unresolved breach between the geologists and the archaeologists. The geologists apologized for upsetting the latter but, unless the archaeologists could disprove the laws of uranium decay, they refused to recant the dates. 50 years later, nothing has changed; worse, subsequent geological dating produced even older dates.

In reality, the artifacts dated to a minimum of 200,000 years. They are probably the greatest technological anachronisms known to modern archaeology. Handbooks. Nowhere on earth were these kinds of spearheads and bifaces older than 35,000 years. At Valsequillo, they were almost ten times older. In a word, if the geological dates were correct, these artifacts were impossible.

In fact, the professional field was faced with a discovery that was doubly impossible:

1. The sheer antiquity of the 200,000 year-old Valsequillo archaeology in the New World when the official paradigm for the first American was set 12,000 years old; and

2. The irreconcilable fact that UP tech was turning up a couple hundred thousand years earlier than its Old World presence.

Reducing the ‘Impossibles’ by One.

In my book, *The First American: The Suppressed Story of the People Who Discovered the New World* 2007 (https://www.amazon.com/First-American-Suppressed-People-Discovered/dp/1564149420), I was able to establish that the advanced Upper Paleolithic blade and bifacial reduction technology at Valsequillo Reservoir was actually...
The impossible puzzles of Valsequillo (cont.)

"Nowhere on earth were these kinds of spearheads alive and well in Africa by at least 350,000 years ago (see Fig. 2). The anomalous "out of place" artifacts did indeed have an Old World precedent!

Then, during the 1990s, a whole slew of Old World discoveries older than 200,000 years were found and showed that pre-Mods were incredibly intelligent, and far more advanced than we ever imagined. And another thing arose, too. It was the idea that maybe scientists had been too quick to cite every new find as its own species. One species cannot produce viable offspring with another species, by definition. So, what happens when all of those Nazi pure blood Aryan superior types discover they are 4% Neanderthal?

This series will focus on these new discoveries, including Diring Yuriakh (Siberia), Schöningen (Germany), Dmanisi (Georgia), and Flores Island’s "Hobbits" (Indonesia). At the end, the question will be posed: When were our ancestors really smart enough to reach the New World?

CHRIS HARDAKER, BA, MA, is an archaeologist working in California and is one of the founding members of the Pleistocene Coalition. He reviewed and catalogued the data from the massive artifact collection of Calico. For details, see the series, The Abomination of Calico, Parts 1-3, beginning in PCN #6, July-Aug 2010, and Calico redux: Artifacts or geofacts: Original 2009 paper updated and serialized for PCN (#24, July-Aug 2013) and its Part 2 (#26, Nov-Dec 2013). For additional in-depth information and quality photographs of tools recovered from the Calico Early Man Site excavations see Calico's "Double-notched" blades from T-22 (PCN #30, July-Aug 2014) and Calico's only classic handaxes (PCN #31, Sept-Oct 2014). Hardaker is also author of the increasingly recognized book, The First American: The suppressed story of the people who discovered the New World.

All of Hardaker’s articles in PCN can be accessed directly at the following link: http://pleistocenecoalition.com/#the_first_american

and bifaces older than 35,000 years. At Valsequillo, they were almost ten times older.”

The second impossible thing still remains: that early pre-Modern humans did not have the intelligence or adaptive genius that it would take for migrating to the New World. For example, no Ice Age archaeology sites over 20,000 years old had been discovered above the Arctic Circle.

How smart were our pre-Mod ancestors? Not very, accord-

UP that our species really lit up the party. Before that we huddled in caves or small huts living day-to-day grunting out an existence. One of the reasons for this abiding belief, at least in Eurasia, was that the stone tool types and technologies remained unchanged for about a million years. No improvements meant no mental evolution, no new ideas, stasis.

Fig. 2. Distribution map of point styles from the African Middle Stone Age c. 350,000–40,000 years ago; from S. McBrearty and A. Brooks. 2000. The revolution that wasn’t: A new interpretation of the origin of modern human behavior. J. Hum. Evol. 39: 453–63. These styles easily fall into the range of variability discovered at Valsequillo, c. 250,000 years old. Compare, for instance, with Fig. 1.
Paleolithic Polyphemus: A review
By David Campbell

"Julien d’Huys and associates decided to revitalize the study of folktales and myths by applying a model and methodologies previously used by biologists and geneticists."

Regularly I receive a digest of academic papers that usually focus upon North American archaeology, particularly those relating to Mississippian culture excavated in Tennessee published by Dale Dye and Kevin Smith. A notable exception was a recommendation by Dale Dye. The title, *Polyphemus: A Palaeolithic Tale*? by Julien d’Huys (including a new take on a well-known Paleolithic representation, Fig. 1), was simply too intriguing to pass by and I downloaded it without hesitation. Though venturing upon the event horizon of my comprehension, it did not disappoint.

Much of what we think we know about the thoughts of Ice Age people can only be inferred from the artifacts of their material culture or their remains in rarely preserved burials. Some of their artwork provides deeper clues but the interpretation of these is so speculative and filtered through the modern mindset that most anthropologists have relegated the thoughts of the artists to the unknowable. Fortunately, a group of scholars have not balked at the invention of computers and statistical programming it ran into limitations that garnered so much criticism that it did not receive a great deal of attention. Julien d’Huys and associates decided to revitalize the study of folktales and myths by applying a model and methodologies previously used by biologists and geneticists.

The representation of the proposed lineage of biological organisms familiar to us all is that of a branching tree based upon similarities and differences in their physical characteristics. In this system each node represents a speciation event in which various lineages split off to form two or more descendant lineages (branches). When the same model is applied to myths or folklore the genes and phenotypes translate to motifs and tale-types, replication to teaching, learning and imitation, hybridization to the mixture of two or more tales, fossils to ancient texts and extinction to disappearance from use.

The biological model is not new as Arnold van Gennep suggested that folkloric elements be studied comparatively with the aid of the biological method back in 1909. The use of phylogenetic software dates only to 2001 when Jun’ichi Oda applied an
alignment used for genome informatics to Propp’s sequence of functions concerning 45 fairy tales. Thus the program could be used to analyze structural relationships in folk tales in the same way amino acids worked in a genome. The same problems that confronted biologists and archaeologists, that of convergence, for example, cropped up with Oda’s method that had never been tested.

This is where d’Huy set about to tackle and eliminate such problems using the largest sampling of versions available and the most up to date statistical and phylogenetic software programs. The ability to process vast amounts of data beyond the limitations of previous researchers was only the first hurdle. Discarding the attempt to find the geographical point of origin of a tale was another. Another problem came with the recognition that looking for parallels sometimes created parallels. Language translations were another issue, not only in the restriction to those known by the researcher but also in bad translations. Like medieval copyists, those recording the tales would sometimes make additions or modifications to align with their own cultural context. Hybridization resulting from migrations and proximity over a vast period of time made it difficult to pinpoint where or when the seeding of the original motifs had taken place. Isolation of elements within a tale could distort results by taking it out of context of the surrounding tale. Thus the tale had to be considered in context with its most original source and whether it was considered representative of local or cultural tradition.

Eventually, d’Huy found a midpoint in his tree of correspondences that connected the motif of Homer’s Polyphemus, a one eyed giant shepherd to that of an earlier form of a lord of the animals that predated livestock domestication. The two tales that retained this element within the hero’s escape from the monster by means of clining to an animal were a surprise. They were found among the Valais people of Switzerland and the Ojibway of North America. This seems to support Walter Burkert’s statement in 1979 that Homer’s Cyclops drew on an older tradition that preceded the Indo-European which included a belief in a lord of the animals. Aside from the statistical data arguing against convergence, the wide distribution of the Ojibway tale among the Crow and other Amerindians refuted any suggestion that it was a recent European import. Considering even a most conservative estimate of the human arrival in the Americas, this places the origin firmly in the Upper Paleolithic.

To further support this idea d’Huys draws attention to the peculiar Magdalenian images in the Trois-Freres cavern in France, copied by Henri Breuil in 1930. This image has been previously interpreted as a bison shaman with a bow or flute or as a hunter disguised in an animal skin. The animal aligned in front of the bison-man is distinguished by a human thigh and a prominent anus/vulva. The bison-man d’Huys is not a predator nor shaman distinct from the herd of animals but rather a part of it as a guardian watching for the escaping hero. In the Amerindian versions of the tale, the hero escapes by entering the animal through its anus thus explaining the imagery in the Trois-Freres cave art. Thus d’Huys suggests that it may be the earliest version of the Polyphemus tale extant. While this interpretation remains speculative it is not unreasonable when combined with what we know of the tale and infer from its history.

This is the third iteration of the study d’Huys has done with this particular folk tale using ever-increasing data sets; and it may not be the last. It does offer a fascinating avenue of inquiry and a promising tool of investigation. This brief synopsis does not begin to do justice to the work Julien d’Huys has done and I strongly urge readers you who are interested in the topic to download the complete paper for study on your own.

References


Abstract: This paper presents an analysis of 56 variants of European and North American examples of the so-called Polyphemus tale (international tale type ATU 1137) using phylogenetic software according to 190 traits. Discussion addresses a number of points of comparative methodology while considering the historical implications of a relationship between different versions of this tale type recorded in diverse cultures.

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

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

Author’s website: anarchaeology.com
News and perspective regarding an early site in Canada’s Yukon

Engineer, rock art researcher and preservationist, Ray Urbaniak—who has written in PCN about the generational potential of oral tradition in U.S. rock art—was first of several researchers to send us news of a recent report regarding Bering Land Bridge theories. The technical report is L. Bourgeon et al., 2017, Earliest Human Presence in North America Dated to the Last Glacial Maximum: New Radiocarbon Dates from Bluefish Caves, Canada. PLOs ONE 12 (1): e0169486. We offer some perspective to this on how anthropology publications continue to mislead science readers with false statements of fact. One popular rendition titled “Archaeological finds put humans in North America 10,000 years earlier than thought: New evidence suggests human presence in a Yukon cave during the last ice age 24,000 years ago” (Hakai Magazine: Coastal Science and Societies, Jan 13, 2017) shows how popular presses simply believe and then echo anthropological press releases without researching whether or not statements made are actually true. For instance, taking into account evidence published in PCN, 24,000 years ago is “not” an old date for early humans in the Americas. Instead, it is a predictably late date. A while back we observed a pattern in anthropology, namely, that a few thousand years are predictably added in increments every few years. At this rate, evidence from sites like Hueyatlaco and Calico wouldn’t be acknowledged for 25–100 years. An ideological motivation that predictable is not science. It suggests the stretching out of a paradigm that has already been demonstrated not in alignment with evidence we already have. Here are a few quotes from the article showing how early dates are rejected and false statements of fact go unchallenged:

“…Cinq-Mars’s conclusions were widely disputed, and the three small caves were largely left out of discussions about the peopling of the Americas”

—Hakai Magazine: Coastal Science and Societies, Jan 13, 2017

Here is one more example to drive the point home:

“The finding—published in the journal PLOs ONE—makes the Bluefish Caves the oldest known archaeological site in North America.”

Psychologist Terry Bradford, PhD, keeps a watch out for technologies such as rope-making, needlework, archery, and other evidences of modern-level intelligence in the Paleolithic record. This time he sends a link to a recent discovery in Croatia (sent later by other readers also) related to a stone object curated by Neanderthals (Neanderthals Capable of Incorporating Symbolic Objects into Their Culture, Discovery Suggests; sci-news.com, Jan 18, 2017). Mainstream anthropology committed to evolutionary ideas continues to treat Neanderthals as barely capable of grasping representation despite a Paleolithic record full of symbolic artifacts of both Homo erectus and Neanderthals suggesting completely modern intellectual ability, e.g., Fig. 1. Such evidence is held back through peer review because if Homo erectus and Neanderthals are recognized as our equals then 150 years of science taught as fact will need to be re-evaluated. –JF
Straight edge use by *Homo erectus*

By John Feliks

The idea that *Homo erectus* people used a straight edge to create bone engravings was first proposed in the paper, "Musings on the Palaeolithic fan motif," Ch. 23 in P. Chenna Reddy (Ed), *Exploring the Mind of Ancient Man*, 2006 (submitted 2004). The paper provided on-the-page tests that I encouraged the reader to do using a simple ruler to prove to themselves beyond any shadow of a doubt that the 400,000-yr. old fan motif engravings from Bilzingsleben, Germany—found in association with the remains of at least two *Homo erectus* individuals—were produced with the aid of a straight edge. The paper also showed that the motifs consisted of ‘duplicated angles’ (the first time such angles were measured) which could easily be superimposed over each other in many different configurations. These observations were contrary to the mainstream claim that no two *Homo erectus* or Neanderthal objects are alike.

I followed this paper with two back-to-back papers at the XV UISPP International Congress in Lisbon, Portugal, 2006 (The Graphics of Bilzingsleben and Phi in the Acheulian) along with 112 slides of geometric studies demonstrating among other things that the Bilzingsleben motifs included many impeccably duplicated angles by way of superimposed protractors. I also demonstrated ratios, fractals, pictorial representation, and the mathematical constant, Phi (the first time demonstrated in a Paleolithic context outside the Acheulian handaxe). The evidence was well-received. However, censorship by competitive researchers began within the week in a conflict lasting five years. The evidence was also blocked by *Journal of Human Evolution* via safely anonymous reviewers. Fig. 1 shows the engravings compiled into a system including duplicated and varied radial motifs and plottable locations on a non-arbitrary grid suggesting mathematical, linguistic, philosophical, and other systems. This version of the figure is simplified from the article in *PCN* #14 (Nov-Dec 2011), “Base grids of a suppressed *Homo erectus* knowledge system” (also in easy to navigate html if still available) which explains in detail each assigned point on the 4-degree base curvilinear grid and potential relationships to trigonometry, etc. The 4-degree grid was not an arbitrary convention I imposed on the artifacts but resulted from laying out the four motifs to scale and plotting their positions in increments that the motifs themselves suggested (including the numbered shells or layers). This was possible because of their impeccably-engraved angles never before measured. The ancient Inca quipu system (Inset) represents zero via sections with no knots. In this Bilzingsleben system, contrary to an editor’s claim that the radial lines not meeting showed a lesser evolutionary stage in *Homo erectus*, I proposed an ‘invisible abstract point’—to which each of the radial fans referred—as representing “zero.” That also provided two directions—one toward a singularity and the other toward infinity. Evidence such as this is censored by mainstream science because it shows *Homo erectus* intelligence equal to our own.

Musings on the Palaeolithic fan motif, Ch. 23 in P. Chenna Reddy (Ed), *Exploring the Mind of Ancient Man*, 2006 (submitted 2004). The paper provided on-the-page tests that I encouraged the reader to do using a simple ruler to prove to themselves beyond any shadow of a doubt that the 400,000-yr. old fan motif engravings from Bilzingsleben, Germany—found in association with the remains of at least two *Homo erectus* facts themselves. Anthropology has no choice but to censor such evidence because it challenges a pre-commitment to evolutionary theory.

John Feliks learned the basics of drafting (straight edge, compass, triangles, etc.) at an early age from his father who was a traditional pre-CAD tool and die designer. That background led to noticing what appeared to be straightedge-drawn lines in ancient bone engravings and to many implications for early human capabilities.
Lithics and relics of East Anglia, U.K., Part 3

I should collect stamps!

By Kevin Lynch and Richard Dullum

The East Anglian region of Britain has for a considerable time been of special interest to the researchers of early man. As far back as 1797 John Frere discovered humanly-manufactured flint implements in a brick pit at Hoxne, a village in the Waveney valley of Suffolk. Frere found shaped flint that he recognized as the work of man and that they belonged to “a very remote period indeed, even beyond that of the present world.”

For some time their discovery was forgotten, but in 1859 the Hoxne brickpit was investigated once again, this time by Sir Joseph Prestwich and Sir John Evans. Later, in 1872, Evans published the first edition of his seminal book Ancient Stone Implements, Weapons and Ornaments of Great Britain.

In 1905 founding members of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia, W. G. Clarke and Dr W. A. Sturge, made further investigations. It was in this year that Clarke had found implements below the Norwich crag, but it was not until James Reid-Moir found similar artifacts below the Suffolk red crag that interest was ignited. Moir attracted the attention of Sir E. Ray Lankester who had become interested in the subject.

Led by Lankester and Moir, anthropologists and geologists now descended upon the East Anglia region, many contributing papers to the newly formed Prehistoric Society of East Anglia. Among them were Leslie Armstrong, Miles Burkitt, Dr. A. E. Peake, J. E. Sainty, A. C. Savin, F. N. Haward and Ms. Nina Layard to mention but a few.

The East Anglia region must have presented a particularly favorite environment for early man. Evidence of their habitation is still regularly found by those with an interest in the subject. My own investigations along the Norfolk and Suffolk coastline regularly produce flint implements fashioned by early man. They are represent Paleolithic, Mesolithic, and Neolithic timelines.

The North Norfolk beaches generally seem to produce Paleolithic worked flints, Levallois examples displaying a true sophistication of the flint knappers’ skill. Anyone suggesting that the individuals who produced these tools were any less intelligent than modern humans today, should experiment with rough blocks of flint themselves and try to produce similar examples.

Fig. 1 Top: Bout-coupé hand axe from West Runton, Norfolk, U.K. Bout-coupé is a type traditionally associated only with Neanderthals of Britain c. 59,000–41,000 years ago.

Middle: Bifacial hooked hand axe or multipurpose hand axe/burin/scaper from West Runton, U.K. The artifact shows standard patina characteristic of artifacts from the Forest Bed.

Bottom: Detail showing the burin or axe point portion. Both tools recovered and photographed by Kevin Lynch.
Weather dictates the ability to search the North Norfolk beaches to a certain extent.

Winter storms expose vast areas of interest to the lithic collector, but it is not the sort of weather to be on a wind-swept beach with winds picking up the sharp sand and stinging faces and hands, as salt spray from the waves adds to the discomfort.

In situations such as these I often wonder what drives me on—philately [the study of stamps, postal history, etc.] often seeming a better considered option for a pastime—but then, suddenly, an Acheulian axe with its tip protruding from the clay layers comes in to view.

My day trip to Norfolk has all been worthwhile. Such is a lithic collector’s lot. I must be mad!!!

We have written much about this site in the pages of PCN. See especially: Following

Fig. 3. A small biface scraper from West Runton, Norfolk, U.K. The artifact was recovered in situ by Kevin Lynch from one of J-R Moir’s Acheulian-age sites. Photo by Kevin Lynch.

Moir along the Norfolk coast at West Runton and Cromer (PCN #38, Nov-Dec 2015); A lithic site at West Runton, Norfolk (PCN #39, Jan-Feb 2016); James Reid-Moir was right on track 100 years ago proven by 850,000-year old footprints recently discovered in Happisburgh, Norfolk, U.K. (PCN #28, March-April 2014); Part 1 of this series (PCN #43, Sept-Oct 2016); and The Repeati-

PCN can be found at the following link:
http://pleistocenecoalition.com/index.htm#Dullum_and_Lynch

KEVIN LYNCH is a retired British businessman, amateur archaeologist, archivist and member of the Prehistoric Society of Britain. He and his wife live in Hadleigh, Suffolk, UK. An avid collector of flints from his local countryside and beaches, Lynch’s specialty is British archaeology of the late 19th and early 20th centuries and the life and works of J. Reid-Moir. He and Richard Dullum have blended their interests in prehistory to write informative articles related to the heyday of British archaeology at the turn of the 20th Century.
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Australia—where telling the truth and helping the tribes is seen as “just another form of invasion”

By Vesna Tenodi MA, archaeology; artist and writer

The new Australian paradigm—its enforcers, its opponents
When I wrote that nothing about Australian prehistory as told by the Aboriginal industry nowadays should be trusted, some of the readers asked me why? Why is the Aboriginal industry so determined to hide the truth? Why are they so eager to fabricate the past, as well as present, losing all credibility in the process?

It comes down to guilt-driven Australian politics. By way of justifying the destruction of archaeological material and reinventing the past, the Aboriginal industry offers reasons such as that the truth is “offensive to Aborigines” and standard archaeological methods are “unethical.”

One of the books deemed as offensive for containing accurate information about Australian prehistory is Cape York: The Savage Frontier by Rodney Liddell. It was self-published in 1996 when political correctness was on the rise. The book was the author’s response to academics who were “deliberately lying and distorting the truth on Australian history in the name of political correctness” (Rodney Liddell www.capeyorkbooks.com). Attempts to ban the book failed, and according to Liddell, The Savage Frontier is now more popular than ever. Political attempts to censor books and similar forms of research or other publications often have that effect.

Liddell was attacked for almost every chapter in the book. Speaking about the Aboriginal invasion of Australia, about the “sacred customs” of infanticide and cannibalism performed openly until just a few decades ago, or about morphological analysis of skeletal remains was deemed unacceptable under the new political regime. Liddell remains unapologetic and is still collecting the facts as learned from his Aboriginal informants.

Sacred Violence
Before contemporary researchers such as Liddell there are other sources of the ‘forbidden past’ which are increasingly difficult to access.

What the authors have in common is that they acted out of love for Aboriginal people, dedicated their lives to examining and recording the Stone Age culture as they witnessed it, kept helping the tribes and advocating for them, and urging the government of the day to treat the tribes with more compassion. Those calls were ignored. But today, the Aboriginal industry claims that “telling the truth and helping the tribes is just another form of invasion” and threatens legal action against anyone who offers constructive criticism or mentions some unpalatable facts about Aboriginal past and present.

Long before Rodney Liddell revisited some politically undesirable facts such as the ever-present problem with Aboriginal violence, British explorer George Gray and humanitarian Daisy Bates detailed the same brutal mindset and violent customs they observed for decades which they recorded in detail in their journals.

More recently, Ted Strehlow (1908–1978), an anthropologist who studied the Aranda people of Central Australia, documented tribal life for forty years (Fig. 1). He amassed...
what is possibly the greatest collection of Aboriginal artefacts and other items ever.

Much like Grahame Walsh, who documented Pre-Aboriginal rock art and was attacked by the Aboriginal industry for his findings including that there was a more technologically-advanced people inhabiting Australia long before the arrival of the Aboriginal tribes, Strehlow too fell out of favor when he asserted that ‘real’ ancient culture was well and truly extinct and was replaced with a fake culture as devised by the Aboriginal industry.

With the rise of the Aboriginal industry which is well-known to no longer allow for free thinking, Strehlow too (just like Grahame Walsh discussed in prior articles) went from glorified to vilified, and was betrayed even by his closest friends. Walsh was vilified for committing the unforgivable sin of attributing Wanjiina and Bradshaw rock art to a pre-Aboriginal race. Strehlow’s sin? He refused to hand over his privately owned collection of artefacts, etc., to contemporary tribes.

The collection consisted of the photos, songs and stories he gathered, as well as the archaeological and ethnographic items entrusted to him by the Aboriginal elders.

Strehlow was one of the greatest promoters and defenders of Aboriginal culture. He was born on the mission run by his father Carl Strehlow, grew up with the Aranda Aboriginal tribe, speaking Aranda before learning to speak English. He was loved and embraced by the tribe as being an Aranda man himself. Seeing that tribal customs were rapidly dying out, Strehlow started recording the Aranda language in 1932. This was the first methodical study of any Aboriginal language ever undertaken. He recorded the customs, ceremonies, thoughts and attitudes of the Aranda people—paying equal attention to the good and the bad, the positive and the negative, and accurately described the lives of the Central Desert tribes (Ted Strehlow, Aranda Traditions, 1947). The book was considered to be a brilliant work, and a pioneering study that provided a great insight into a dying culture (Again, see Fig. 1 on prior page).

The Aranda elders were appreciative of his work to the extent they said he was the only man they can fully trust with their important tribal objects. They kept bringing him archaeological and ethnographic items, and explained that the old customs were drying and the new generation of tribal men can no longer be trusted. Over forty years, on top of recording images, songs, and stories, Strehlow kept building his collection of sacred ceremonial objects and artistic items given to him by the tribal chiefs.

After a lifetime of dedication, in the last years of his life he clashed with a new generation of Aboriginals—with exactly the type of people the elders warned against. But since the tribal elders who had been giving him the artifacts by the early 1970s were all dead, the new breed of politically empowered people who claimed to be Aranda started demanding ownership of the collection.

Strehlow refused, saying that to do so would be contrary to the promise he had given the real Aranda chiefs. Also, he pointed out that by the 1970s the Aranda culture was extinct, with all spirituality evaporated and customs forgotten. He enraged the Aboriginal industry even further with his objections to what had become known as “Aboriginal art,” claiming that genuine ancient art had turned into national kitsch, with all authenticity gone.

Seeing the Aboriginal industry aggressively promoting an invented culture, Strehlow simply said it’s all a lie, and started publishing his own records of tribal customs (Ted Strehlow, Songs of Central Australia, 1971). For this defiance, Strehlow—who was until the 1970s regarded as the ‘last Aranda man,’ the last person knowledgeable about real Stone Age tribal culture—fell into disgrace. When he decided to publish some of the photographs from his personal collection, under the title “Secrets of the Aranda” in two issues of People magazine in 1978 (Fig. 2)
Australia—where telling the truth = invasion (cont.)

and provided the German magazine, Stern, with 211 color slides and 78 black & white photographs—he became the enemy of the state. The Aboriginal industry was enraged and People magazine which published his material was banned.

Who can you trust?

Seeing even his lifelong friends and supporters falling into the trap of political correctness and siding with the Aboriginal industry Streblow made a will and left the entire collection to his wife Kathleen Stuart Streblow. He believed she was the only one he could trust to resist the pressure and not allow the collection to fall into the hands of modern Aborigines who, in Streblow’s own words at the time, “no longer have any knowledge of the authentic tribal culture, since the elders and guardians of the secrets were all dead and that whole world is finished, and will never come back” (Songs of Central Australia, 1971).

Following Streblow’s death in 1978, Kathleen inherited the collection, as the sole legal owner of his lifelong work. She did resist the harassment—for a while. However, Aborigines kept making demands for her to hand over the collection. She replied that the material was Ted Streblow’s personal property and that he was free to leave it to anyone he wished. Since she was the rightful owner and guardian of the collection she ignored the Aborigines who tried to claim any rights over the material. She dismissed them as pretenders—“nouveaux Aborigines,” as she called them, in league with “rip-off white advisors” and “plagiarising anthropologists” (Janet Hawley, “The Streblow Collection: Preserved in Vitriol,” Sydney Morning Herald 1987).

When a delegation of Aboriginal people came to make claims on the collection, she dubbed them “The Gang of 15” and later came to say: “When sweeping statements are made ‘give the objects back’—I answer, to whom? Which Aborigines? I have flung down the challenge: Any Aborigine who thinks he has a legitimate claim to any object can come and see me and I’ll check his credentials. I want to know the names of his ancestors, his totem, the name verses of the songs. Not one has come forward” (Hawley 1987; author’s emphasis).

To the complaint that she, as a woman, should not have right of control of tribal objects, Kathleen Strehlow replied: “I am a white woman, so those Aboriginal laws don’t apply to me” (ibid).

Such statements further infuriated the Aboriginal industry, which kept up the demands for her to “hand over the collection.”

To be continued...
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