

CHAPTER I.

A SEPARATE WORLD:

THE EUROPEANS DISCOVER THE AMERICAS

“Philosophical givens” are central to ideas directing a scientific consensus, not only regarding Native American origins but also modern man's first presence in the Old World. These “givens” help establish “taboos”, areas that would cast doubt on philosophical starting points defining “consensus opinion”. Certainly most consensus is proven correct in time. Yet, when resolution seems unobtainable, the philosophical given (and the “paradigms” that eternalize the theoretical framework) must be questioned. It is when chaos is found that taboos must be re-examined for they may reveal clues to the world of the un-explored. With a thorough appreciation of these perspectives in mind, we challenge anthropologists to examine a number of “philosophical givens” and address long standing taboos.

Our primary concern in these first Chapters is to lay a foundation for the layman of the pending challenge to the Euro-centric contention that has ruled out an American genesis for all human populations living today. An ancient American wellspring holds a great and enduring legacy of human accomplishments that brought mankind to the shores of once distant worlds. The search for the province that mankind first began this odyssey is as relevant today as understanding the journey itself. Both the World and our understanding of our place amongst it are a testament of the human accomplishment to explore. It seems the human spirit has no boundaries less we create them from our own reluctance.

A young Passamaquady brave once asked, “Why do you call us Indians?” His missionary teacher answered, “Because your lands are east of the Indus River.”¹ This classic interpretation of the Native American Indian and his world has plagued them from the Columbus’ discovery. The first Spanish explorers’ descriptions of the Indians were those of a lost race devoid of such attributes as agriculture, civilization, marriage, morals, medicine, metal goods, and above all, religion. This limited view of the Native American Indians slowly changed with the discovery of Northwest Pacific Coast Chiefdoms and Mayan, Incan, and Aztec achievements to mention only a few highly “civilized” societies. It should not surprise anyone that New World Indian societies held the world’s most functionally beautiful cities, superior aqueduct and agricultural systems, hieroglyphic texts, written records and books, astronomical ceremonial worship, and intricate social and political organizations.

Following the discovery of the New World, it became vitally important to explain for European theosophy the presence of Native People in the Americas.

“It is in there’ present condition that we are to behold, as in a mirror, the features of our own progenitors.” (Adam Ferguson, Edinburgh University, 1767)

The theory that mankind originated in the New World has had many champions beside those native to the Americas. Perhaps, the first European to contemplate an autochthonous view was Bartolemue de Las Casas (1484-1566), a Catholic missionary who traveled to Hispaniola in 1502, witness to some of the first encounters between New and Old World civilizations.

¹ (from White Man's Indian; R.F. Berkhofer; 1978)

Las Casas was also engaged in the search for gold and silver that accompanied the Spanish exploitation of the indigenous. Diggings of the early Spaniards in the Caribbean Islands revealed that ancient hearths existed well below the immediate horizon of human habitation. Las Casas was intrigued by the implications this had regarding the antiquity of the Indian. He postulated many alternatives to the religious orientations that he understood as a European scholar. Surmising that these Native people were living their lives in a way that the earliest Europeans may have once lived he could be likened to an anthropologist in a Friars robe. Regarding the placement of the aboriginal nations, Las Casas understood that they were far removed from the cultures of the Old World. He was willing to debate with himself the scope of the isolation of these people. In itself, Las Casas was the first theologian to entertain the length of the isolation that afforded these Indigenous People an origin from within the Americas.

Clearly, the discovery of people in the Americas created an alternative to biblical scripture founded in the belief that the earliest societies of the Americas contained the most intrinsic element of human society, an ancient form of reciprocity. Isaac de la Peyrere, in 1655, attended another ancient concept in his work, *A Theoretical System upon that Presupposition that Men were before Adam*. In this continuation of the work inaugurated by Las Casas, Peyrere addressed theosophical limitations that later anthropologists would directly encounter in the 19th and 20th Centuries. For the first time, Europeans began to look into the Americas as if it were a mirror to their own questions concerning their own origins, even if they were ordained to fit in Judeo-Christian definitions. The principal components of human origins applied to the Americas well before scientific inquiry into mankind's past would herald the basic tenants of evolutionary theory. Identifying the *arrival* of the first Americans set the stage for the revolution into evolutionary thought where-by Linneaus could, in 1790, classify God's Creation into order's that would link the myriad forms. This procession led to the identification of a scientific framework, eventually leading to the discovery of evolutionary process. So instrumental was Linneaus' work to understanding evolutionary process that it was the Society that reflects his name that Darwin's work would be first presented.

It seems that European beliefs, be they theological or scientific, could not entertain the idea that the ancestors of Old World peoples could possibly be American Indians. The result remains that the theories that guide our observations are bound to the givens we inherited with anything that might challenge becoming taboo. These beliefs have been handed down while we must ask if censure is flawed by conjecture and opinion lacking fundamental understanding of the alternative view held by the original inhabitants of the Americas. We have chosen to follow a path of our own making. The trickster has shown the Algonquin that you can not live or move into the forest relying only on strategies that you learned in hunting Caribou in the grasslands. The trick to undoing the obstacles we find in exploring how to navigate the world of scientific inquiry should require researchers to first validate the methods and possible prejudices that might lead us astray in the first place. I am not suggesting we forget what we have uncovered from the past. However, we must be on our guard of internal prejudice that forestalls the recognition of alternative views of the past.

Native Americans understood the immensity of the Americas and their place in this vastness, maintaining knowledge of this in interpretations held in historical records.

These embellished stories and myths are revealed in the messages depicted in the lives and historical renditions of the past, as for example, Anishinaabe wampum belts. The movements of Old World people into these remote reaches of the Americas has since altered the historical translations held by the ancestors who have, as they see it, from a time immemorial, inhabited the Western Hemisphere.

In historical perspectives, the annals often incorporated into the written history of the Americas does not include, often enough, the appropriation of histories of the original people who were already here. Their messages remain an integral element of each and every tribe's original knowledge while historians have long ignored and underestimated the wealth of historical fact contained in them. By removing cultural artifacts including wampum belts and other depiction's of histories and their lessons from the past (the heart of indigenous life), museum collectors have left intrinsic understandings and historical interpretations of the indigenous' "past", less-then-what-it-should-be. How people came to find their current place in the Americas is retrieved in these depictions, and thus, great mysteries are revealed. These journeys into the past are revealed in myths and stories relived by the Fire in Ceremonies entrusting a spiritual connection by exemplifying daily life through traditional revisiting. Traditions are anecdotes, gained in the life of any given people. Be they reenacted in celebration or simple observances, the defining elements of a Culture are intertwined with the past.

The lives, journeys, and histories of Native American Tribes has suffered without these hereditary records, contributing to the present condition that finds many Native people reluctant to share what remains of their cultural ways. However, contributions made by non-native to the understanding of their "way of live" can be attributed to numerous adventurers who wrote, painted, and photographed depictions that hold today accurate portrayals of the original people of the Americas. Many of these important insights into Indian Life furnished by early ethnologists have been discounted including the observance of the Sundance Ceremony and other origin stories.

Can human origins be traced to the New World? An evolutionary explanation that transcends both spiritual and scientific explanation might offer us lessons beyond that of where we originated on planet Earth. If anthropologists continue to ignore the plausibility of origin stories by insisting that they be first, scientifically based, then truth will continue to elude us. Will the proper interpretation of the past remain, un-known, or exhaustively likened to another species that may have no relationship to our own origins except that it too evolved from a similar Earthly process. This book attempts to bridge the gap between myth and science by identifying the evolutionary impact properly interpreting the Native American belief "that they have always been here", holds evolutionary theory.

CHAPTER II.

EUROPEAN CONCEPTS AND THE ORIGINS OF THE FIRST AMERICANS

Bartolome de Las Casas became a leading advocate and benefactor of Native American rights, returning to Spain several times to champion for a more humane treatment of the “Indian”. He believed that “they too were the sons and daughters of a benevolent God, and so, worthy of his teachings.”² Yet, continued persecution of the Indian accompanied an unwitting contempt for their primitive way of life leaving little reason to include them in the “family of man.” In Las Casas there was a champion of the indigenous cause and he returned to Spain to argue that their treatment by the Spanish Conquistadors was not in balance with the wishes of the church and/or the crown. His attempt to identify atrocities accompanying the conquest of Mexico culminated in 1550 when he argued with Juan Gines Supulveda in the Spanish court as to whether the peoples of the New World had a soul. If so, were they worthy of attempts to convert them to Christianity? Las Casas won his argument but, if the Native refused Christianity they were destined to for conquest and enslavement. In accompanying this decree, “heathens”, who chose to resist the teachings of the church, were persecuted in the most inhuman ways.

Queen Isabelle’s court attended to the Native Inhabitants membership in “the family of man”, thus allowing them to be considered subjects of the Spanish Kingdom. Las Casas did not win or loose his case, only gaining the directive from the Court counseling more humane treatment of the hemispheres native people. The crown’s knowledge of ongoing atrocities did not prevent them from continuing in Spain’s new realm. Not only did Las Casas consider that these cultures maintained a code of social conduct that was superior to Old World European civilizations, but that their technological understandings were highly evolved. Worth noting is the soldiers inquiry as to whether they had “found Heaven upon arriving into the great city of Tahetchuacan?”

Las Casas efforts unfortunately required the Indian to assimilate biblical scripture through *reduccion*, a system that ultimately dislocated Indian people from their families and their culture. His *reduccion* system later spread throughout colonial Spain and, much later, adopted by protestant missionaries in New England and Africa. Through this *reduccion* the Catholic Church allowed the savage the same rights of god fearing Old World peoples. Certainly, the alternative of them being ancestral had no explanations from the biblical foundations of the day despite the intriguing question their origins presented. Las Casas view of a possibility great antiquity for the Native Americas was based not only on their primitive nature but on the presence of ancient hearths that were discovered in the silver mines of Hispanola.

Isaac de la Peyrere in 1655 undertook the theological investigation in revealing the “presumption that men were before Adam.” He, as most other thinkers of his time, applied religious definitions to the question of the presence of people in the Western Hemisphere, in an attempt to explain a pre-Darwinian rise to humanness from the domains of the Americas. He too, was an exception, able to apply legitimate concepts to Indigenous beliefs; that they originated in the Americas.

Judeo-Christian doctrine deferred the Indian natives as a “lost tribe”. Though inappropriate, this concept eventually permitted the pagan Indian societies acceptance

² see Prescott, *The Conquest of Mexico* 19

into the family of man whether or not they were descendants of Adam and Eve.³ Tracing the “White Man’s Indian” back beyond the Greeks, Egyptians, and Biblical Hebrews helped answer a confounding question of the 15th and 16th centuries; “Where did the Indian come from and how did he get here?”⁴

Unequivocally, the “given” answer to this question was first theorized by Jose de Acosta in 1590 and later championed by others including Thomas Jefferson. Acosta’s description of a migration from the Old World across the Bering Land Bridge from Siberia has continued to be the most popular – though still unproved – theory accounting for man’s presence in the Americas. The continuance of this and other evolutionary theories of ancient man found convenient support in the 19th century mixing of science and religion. The Indian was the one who remained, in his natural form, the remnant of an ancient society. During the 19th century, cultural anthropology was applied to the New World to provide Europeans with answers to their own origin.

Contributions from the Social Front

Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, forefathers of the Constitution, gave thoughtful deliberation to the indigenous way of life, incorporated many of these previously unknown systems into the formulation of our dawning American government. They saw in the social systems of the Native Americans a mirror of what must have been part of the European’s long lost original instructions. The discovery that Amerindian social systems were principled in the believe that all men⁵ were created equal, they incorporated them into the American Constitution, vowing that the Americas should not be governed by laws inherited from Old World monarchies. As mentioned earlier, “Jefferson postulated in 1816 that the diversity of Native American languages were so great “that the tribes speaking them could not possibly understand one another.” From this observation, he estimated that Native Americans had “lived long enough in the Americas to be the parent stock of Asian people!” Jefferson, however, accepted an Asian origin and with it the work of Acosta and the summation that man in order to enter the Americas must have crossed the Bering Land Bridge, although it’s existence was unknown at the time.

An important advocate was George Catlin, a New England portrait artist who sought to accurately portray the Plains Indian Tribes by exploring the original route taken into their lands by Lewis and Clark. Between 1830 and 1835 Catlin was welcome into this world, a world that had remained virtually unknown to the European mind. His notes were the most expressive literary documentation of its time of Plains Indian Life while his paintings portrayed a visual world that many Europeans could not accept. For the traditional people themselves, viewing the likeness of their own image disrupted their state of being and many would avoid having their own portraits created.

Catlin became a champion of the indigenous. In living amongst the tribes of the Great Plains he come to appreciate their honesty and integrity, not being the first to qualify this observation. He later traveled to Europe with many of these new-found brothers, returning them to their tribes, themselves enlightened in the ways of the European. Yet, museum collectors believing them to represent unreal portraits and exaggerations of a people that had no European comparisons often ignored Catlin’s

³ see Gould 1999

⁴ Berkhofer; 1978

⁵ and women, although women did not vote in Colonial times it suited many Tribes in the Americas

depictions of Indian life. Although appreciated today for the likeness of the world they contained, an appreciation of these works detailing the life of the Plains Indian may have been restrained in his time. Although much of his collection was finally bought the vast majority of the proceeds received from their sale were not made in his lifetime. The man, who is understood as the first European to depict indigenous Plains life, did himself die a poor man in relative obscurity.

Another non-Indian benefactor of the indigenous was Charles Lummis, an explorer and photographer of the American Southwest, founder of the Southwest Museum of Natural History. With camera and pencils in hand he provided for the outside world glimpses of the cultural and religious traditions of the Hopi, Zuni, Navajo, and other Southwestern tribes. The illumination of the Hopi Snake Dance Ceremony remains the only visual portrayal of this ceremony afforded the European. This dance is held in a ceremonial kiva where man and snake become one and an explanation of the magical powers in the creation of mystical beliefs are retold. With the aid of hallucinate herbs, Hopi Dancers and rattlesnakes alike are able to merge as one in a trance-like state. Entertwined are the bodies of the rattlers, who in sharing the herbs placed at the floor of the Kiva, are able to accept the dancers, going so far as to endow their handlers to carry them in their mouths. In this state, Lummis argued were the boundaries of human understanding and kinship with the natural world. He believed, further, that the cultural knowledge found in independent tribal affinities were so vast that they afforded an existence that would predate man's arrival into the Old World. Lummis may have been influenced by the same stories later told to Frank Waters as the Hopi believe that everyone's roots lie in the Americas.

The photographs that Lummis was able to take brought a reality to the European mind that Catlin's paintings could only suggest were true. It is in understanding the story behind Catlin's and Loomis's images and in properly interpreting their notes that the mind of the indigenous can touch the imagination. In itself, many of Catlin's depiction's, those portraying Sundance and other religious ceremonial practices of the Plains Indians, were dismissed by Europeans as unbelievable portrayals of a world that could not possibly exist. The lack of likeness, the independent cultural foundations, and the vast differences that separated the European and the indigenous mind created a rift that carried with it the orientation of a separate reality. By embracing the past, the perfection's and shortcoming, we can begin to find a universal kinship with the elder teachings of native People and rekindle ancient ways humanity shares.

Henry Morgan, perhaps Americas' first anthropologist identified the social working of the American indigenous while, foreign researchers found similar discoveries in native societies throughout the world. During the early days of the classificatory-descriptive period (1840 - 1914) his interpretations were instrumental in guiding insight into tribal societies, how they functioned, and their ancient connections to the past. Fundamental concepts were ascribed by Morgan from studies of the Paquady and Iroquois. From interpretations of their way of life and their social structure or moiety (clan structure) kinship systems were properly understood. Morgan began to identify the social significance of clan and moiety and how they ascribed secular ranking with-in tribal societies.

At first it seemed to Morgan that intermarriage would have been prevalent since he was unable to determine the exactness of their social structure. Morgan published

early interpretations of this miss-understanding in 1860, *Ancient Society*, leading Australian mercenary Fitzpatrick to read this work. Fitzpatrick was familiar with the terms and definitions outlined by Morgan and was inspired to write him with his own proper interpretations based on his studies of the Aboriginal Australian. It seemed that kinship systems identifying brother, sister, uncle, aunt—when interpreted properly—prevented intermarriage and provided an independent, social understanding that had few parallels in aristocratic Europe. Morgan accepted the proper relationships Fitzpatrick identified and a valid understanding of indigenous, kinship structure was placed in its rightful order. From this it was concluded that the social make-up defining kinship was highly advanced and may have been in place from very early on in the history of man. Here is an example of assumptions that later change by properly re-interpreting the question at hand. This process led to a better appreciation of the matrix of tribal social order be it African, Asian, Australian, European, or Native American.⁶

It was the Indian who had remained unchanged, maintaining in their purest form a more definitive social classification, especially when measured against European Monarchy and elitism, the prevailing, (and still champion!), social system. Morgan's work was instrumental in guiding the development of what would become the "communist manifesto". Subscribed under the pretext of "Utopian Society" Engles and Marx offered a realignment of social structure that has, today, lost in favor of individual rights above and beyond those interwoven within a society. Even the burgeoning capitalists system is the outgrowths of freedoms charted in the Bill of Rights that have now been deregulated into divested ownership of the worlds resources. Patents have no doubt hastened advancements that bring us to our current place in the modern world, but at what cost. That the indigenous examples led to important contributions to many social ideals, be they in the formation of the American Constitution or Marxist doctrines, they remain unheralded contributions in the shaping of the ideologies of today's governments. This contribution, however, should not be eschewed as a cause of today's woes, but rather, as valuable lessons from the past. These misunderstood doctrines could help us grasp the nature of future societies, if indigenous systems are ever placed in their rightful order, the source of our cultural orientations.

The Debate as it Rages Today

Americanists, a term used to define American anthropologists and archaeologists (in deference to the "British School" of thought), interpretations followed on the heels of European advancements with the 19th Century dawn of anthropological thought and its scientific terms and limits. Formulas and theories generated in the Old World were applied to the New World while most evaluations by Americanists rarely questioned the limits applied by European "authorities". With this, many of the ideas and interpretations drawn from the New World's archaeological findings were deemed unacceptable as they were incompatible with interpretations built from archaeological discoveries from the Old World.

The domination of European perspectives, civilized perspectives, if you will, continues to remain unabated to-this-day. These same perspectives and the adherence to fundamental believes can be seen as both instrumental and, yet, sometimes, detrimental

⁶ Morgan's work played a major role in influencing the later work of Karl Marx and Frederick Engles.

to science and scientific advancements. The earliest European civilizations (Egyptian, Greek, and Roman societies) became the dominant ideal, helping shape the world of the human race. Simply, origin stories emanating from Europe defined the world in theosophical terms.¹⁴ The history of man is often measured in comparison with European scientific terms, dominated by reflections of markedly “civilized” achievements.

Taken in a historical perspective, anthropological science as a device or tool is often found to adhere to ongoing academic formulae, creating a scientific “manifest destiny”. that every so often impedes the objective projection of either new ideas and/or the required justification to change the old. In essence, the “consensus reality” that frequently dominates other-than European cultural, religious, and authoritarian process is often defined by models derived from European scientific and theological terms. This general overview is perhaps manifested in the American archaeological psyche where in its first definition the presence of human beings in the Americas was forced to adhere to ideologies characterized in European religious terms.⁷ The boundaries of the conceptual presence for mankind in the Americas was prescribed to fit within the fundamental religious guidelines initiated by the belief that all humans must have had a common divinity with “all our relatives” on Noah’s Ark. Not until the early 19th century were scholarly alternatives to religious conscription readily available. Today the ongoing perceptions regarding our divine affinity to a European God remains a steadfast belief, a conceptual orientation of ideas widespread and manifest throughout the world.

Anthropological science and the resulting identification of human and Neandertal fossil remains did not surface as a challenge to these religious ideals until the mid-19th century. The discovery of an earlier Neandertal presence and/or subsequent perspectives of a transitional phase leading to modern humans in Europe (and elsewhere) left open little possibility for arguments to the contrary.⁸ Today’s challenges to these early definitions can be found in the “rapid replacement” (Stringer 1982 and 1989) or “mitochondrial Eve hypothesis” (Cann et al. 1987), theories that find themselves countering empirical knowledge drawn from earlier European discoveries. The “traditional” proponents (Multi-regional theorists)¹⁷ continue to maintain that separate hominid populations uniformly transformed themselves in every continent into modern humans. Simply put, the European discoveries of the mid-19th century fossil finds continue to pervade the available evidence that would insinuate that this sudden transition

⁷ Fundamental religious campaigns attempting to contest the validity of scientific evolutionary perspectives continue to this day and, in this author's opinion, are a threat to scientific evaluations offering New World evolutionary alternatives. For alternatives to Biblical scriptures see: Peyrère, Issac de la, *A Theological System upon that Presupposition That Men were before Adam*. London. Published first in Latin in 1655. This translation actually appeared in 1656 bound with La Peyrère, 1656; Larkin, Frederick *Ancient Man in America*. New York 1880; and Landa, Diego De, *Relación de Choses de Yucatán de Diego de Landa*, translated by Charles E. Brasseur de. Paris 1864.

⁸ Stringer, Christopher B., *ibid*, pg. 51-72; and Stringer, "Some Problems in Middle and Upper Pleistocene hominid Relationships," in Chivers DJ, Joysey KA (eds): *Recent Advances in Primatology* London: Academic Press, Vol 3, 1978, pp. 395-418; Towards a Solution to the Neanderthal Problem. *J Hum Evol* 1982, 11:431-438; and "Documenting the origin of modern humans," Stringer in Trinkaus, op. cit., 1989, pg. 67-96. Eldredge, N. and Ian Tattersal, *The myths of human evolution*. New York: Columbia University Press 1982; and Tattersal, Ian., "Species Concepts and Species Identification in Human Evolution," in *Journal of Human Evolution* 1992, 22:341-349. Clearly, *Homo sapiens* are not the same species as *Homo erectus*. Is there evidence of a "transition or replacement?"

is very difficult to validate with scientific evidence from any continent. In light of today's vast anthropological knowledge and the valuable reinterpretations of the early general outlines accompanying the initial European anthropological interpretations, a general statement can be inferred; that a scientific consensus does not exist with respect to the origins of modern humans. This present lack of agreement should fuel a need to define alternate explanations, promote the evaluation of new perspectives and heighten the search for new theories that should - in scientific terms - present themselves in a clear and orderly fashion.

Science is a conservative activity, and scientists are reluctant to change their explanatory frameworks. . . Scientists may also be reluctant to change paradigms for the purely psychological reasons that the familiar is often more comfortable than the unfamiliar and that inconsistencies in belief are uncomfortable. . . When dissonance is present, in addition to reducing it, the person will actively avoid situations and information which would likely increase the dissonance. If unexplained facts can be glossed over or reduced in importance or simply accepted as givens, the possible inadequacy of the current theory does not have to be confronted. Then, when a new theory gives a compelling explanation of the previously unexplained facts, it is "safe" to recognize them for what they are.⁹

There is a reflection of fundamental scientific resolve and the drive for absolute knowledge so often generated by consortiums of previous believers. The world, and what we know we don't know, would be less than it is today if we did not allow ourselves to challenge traditional foundations, knowledge, and assessments. The current resistance to ideas of change in many scientific fields (in business and in politics) parallels the difficulty that faced turn-of-the-century American avocational and professional anthropologists and many of their own assertions that the American Indian had an autochthonous origin in the Americas.¹⁰

CHAPTER III.

Theosophical And Philosophical Contentions: Positioning The Cart Before The Horse

Theories and the Planting of Seeds

⁹ Lightman and Gingerich 1992 pp. 694

¹⁰ Ameghino op. cit. 1915; and "New Discoveries of Fossil Mammalia of Southern Patagonia" in *American Naturalist* 1893

Scientific challenges to religious interpretations during the 18th Century set the backdrop for the subsequent evolution of the science of man, anthropology. The formation of paradigms and, as well, the theories that grew from them, led early scientists to adopt philosophical givens whose basic tenants were grounded in theosophical European concepts of the day. This relationship quarantined alternatives representing a challenge to the most basic belief of an Old World source for our beginnings. The study of mankind's past became a European science, adhering to philosophical givens emanating from the European Continent. Much like the Christian Religion, the adherence to a new scientific scripture, if you will, led anthropologists to challenge any beliefs that were counter productive to the emerging Euro-centric paradigm. With this limitation fully entrenched, anthropology created its own collection of "taboos". Mankind's journey began in the Old World, period!

The assessment of a created order for our place in the Kingdom of God was first advanced by Karl Linne Linnaeus, a Swedish botanist in his classic study, *Systema Naturae*, published in 1758. This system broke individual organisms into separate inter-related groupings; SUPER KINGDOM, KINGDOM, PHYLUM, SUB-PHYLUM, CLASS, ORDER, FAMILY, GENUS, SPECIES. *Systema Naturae* was, after Linnaeus' death, used to suggest that man is part of the "animal kingdom", even if only an advanced member of the Higher Primate Family. Linnaeus is also credited with naming the human species *Homo sapiens* ("wise man" or "thinking man"). He was, however, unable to explain the Judeo-Christian model of "Creation" while his outline accommodates today an ascribed Native American philosophy that "all our relations" are part of a natural order and mankind's place in it is equally corresponding.

In the middle of the 19th Century Charles Darwin (1802 -1882) began to apply the Linnean system of biological and botanical organization to the origins of all species, including man. The revolution of scientific thought centered mankind's place in this natural order as it is our own past that most intrigued researchers. Although Darwin is credited with the concept that the variation in living species is the result of selection, his first concern was in identifying man's place in the animal kingdom. It was Alfred R. Wallace who first answered the question of descent by postulating that; the

"Action of Natural Selection,
through Divergence and Character and Extinction,
on the descendants of a common parent—
Explains the grouping of all organic beings."

Darwin sub-titled his own ground-breaking book;

"The Origins of Species by Means of Natural Selection or
the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life."

Clearly, it was Wallace's work in South America and Indonesia that ultimately laid the foundation for the theory that humans must certainly trace their earthly origins back to primate predecessors. Did Wallace believe that evolutionary scientists should include the New World members of the Higher Primate family in the search for our

human progenitors? Maybe!¹¹ Then and now scientific opinions, linking us to a definite earlier primate form, have been less than willing to test the potential of a higher primate base for our ancestors within the Americas. Since there is no obvious resolution in sight to the 140 year old debate concerning missing links, is it best to explore what is not obvious? I have in this Introduction, attempted to examine why this inauspicious solution has not been adequately addressed, why it has been overlooked, and why it remains untested to this day. It would do us well and good to understand the limits of our initial orientation and the assertions drawn from them as inanimate, before we tempt to divert our attention to the resolutions anthropologists seek to uncover.

European interpretations of the age and relationships of the earth (geology) and its human inhabitants (anthropology) began to take shape during the last half of the 19th Century. Europe became the cradle of anthropologic thought following the conformity of geologic foundations proposed by Charles's Lyell and evolutionary principals outlined by Darwin. Their hypotheses, based on physical discoveries, would eventually successfully challenge religious interpretations although they did not go so far as to redirect the question as to the origins of Native Americans as anymore than a migration, out of Asia. There were those, however, who later contemplated an autochthonous Amerindian origin for all *Homo sapiens* and they include some of the best thinkers of their time.

Evidence for the idea that humans might be able to trace their origins back into the Americas came from discoveries made by avocational archeologists, scholars, paleontologists, and miners looking for gold. The discoveries associated with many early "early man" finds remain, for the most part, in a state of limbo. Compounding the acceptance was the problem in dating as many methods used today were not available. These 19th Century claims, suggesting as they did a great antiquity for the human species within the Americas, were unable to gain address in part because the revolution in anthropology was not willing to grow beyond the confines of Europe theosophy. This may be due to the fact that they challenged the antiquity of our modern human form as inferred from European discoveries that suggested a pre-sapient or Neandertal ancestry for the European. Man could not, for them, have originated in the Americas first because the early finds were all fully modern human in appearance, unlike the oldest hominids of Europeans, the Neandertals. Moreover, if living Europeans were not first Neandertals then the Europeans would have to trace themselves to an origin outside of Europe, an unwelcome contemplation of the time or, for that matter, this time.

The champions of the alternative, suggesting an autochthonous or in-situ origin for the American Indian, also had scholarly representatives who were respected for their interpretations and work in related academic fronts. Among those who chose to support an evolutionary based ancestral antiquity of mankind in the Americas were evolutionist' Alfred Russell Wallace, paleontologist' Florentino Ameghino, geologist' J. D. Whitney, linguist' Alexander Chamberlain, and anti-conformist' William Sidis. Perhaps the best known was Alfred R. Wallace, a younger contemporary of Charles Darwin, who, in fact, answered the question concerning Darwin's inquiry into the cause of speciation. His travels to South America followed Darwin's.¹² The loss of these studies may have affected the direction of human evolutionary science. Fortunately he survived and

¹¹ Alfred R. Wallace (1879)

¹² Unfortunately, his notes and drawings, representing several year's work in South America, were lost when the ship carrying him and his work back to Europe sank off the coast of Brazil.

returned to Europe where he sought funding that took him to Sumatra, the Island of Borneo and Sabah. It was exploring life on the Indonesian island of Ternate that he would answer Darwin's inquiry into the cause for the origins and variety of species. It was in a near death state (resulting from a bout with malaria), that the answer to the question first posed by Darwin was revealed to Wallace. In a daze Wallace struggled out of his bed, and, with sweat pouring from his brow, jotted down the answer that had long eluded Darwin. Wallace noted "that the tendency of species to find variation are based on an order transcribed to the effects of natural selection." Wallace recovered and wrote back to Darwin, in a short paper, the ideas conceived during his illness and thus was the theory of "Natural Selection" born. He relayed his insights, in a 1858 letter to Darwin, identifying the mechanism of our own origins as a process of evolution resulting from the consequences of natural selection.

While Wallace was in Borneo Darwin remained in England, compiling the work he would later publish, waiting, in the light of the Religious backdrop of mid-19th Century Europe, for definitive proof. Darwin shared his correspondence from Wallace with Charles Lyell and Joseph Hooker, acknowledging that without definitive answers to the cause of speciation, the theory would be unqualified. We must remember that Darwin and Wallace were asking the questions they did in order to determine man's own place as a member of the animal world for, the fact is, it was our own species that early evolutionists wanted to know the most about. The concept that animal species mirror our own process in climbing the "tree of Life" carries over to the Native concept that "we are all related" that evolution has intended us our own place in the niche.

Finally, the time had come to challenge theoretical religious interpretations with scientific validation offering a coherent explanation of mankind's own evolution, as a process resulting from "natural selection". Wallace's letter and earlier unpublished ideas held by Darwin since 1838, were presented to the Linnean Society by Lyell and Hooker in July 1858. Darwin's work and ideas were the basis for the inquiry that would set the tone for anthropological investigations of the future. Darwin published his 1862 definitive work, "*The Origins of Species*", justifying the scientific validation to the questions concerning the tendency of species to change. Wallace, while in Ternate, was far removed from the place and people that derived much of the acclaim he was so much a part of making. Upon his return Wallace was recognized for his contribution to the formation of the theory but remained in Darwin's shadow. Today Wallace is remembered as "Darwin's moon", near to the center of evolutionary science's grand equation.

Yet, evolution's great leap forward has still to free anthropology of the constraints creationists expose when missing links to our own past remain unexplained. The compelling observation (of missing links to our past), underlies religious authority's ongoing challenge to human evolutionary theory. Wallace's rational regarding the antiquity of the Native American and the far-reaching age of the modern human anatomy could eclipse his 19th Century discovery of "natural selection" should anthropologists reflect again on his observations surrounding the stability of the human anatomy.

European evolutionary concepts followed the dawn of Darwin's definitive book "*The Origins of Species*", providing alternatives to religious explanations. Theosophical explanations remained, however, and the common thread that would link Native American origins with the emerging science of anthropology ordained them as migrants from Asia. Comparisons could be drawn by linking basic tenants of both religion and

anthropologic theory. In either case, the Indian must be traced to the Old World, or so it should seem! These roots were first cast in Biblical renditions including Noah's Ark followed by the more scientific approach accredited to Acosta's theory of a migration across the Bering Land Bridge. European religious doctrine left little room (for the dawning science of anthropology), to embrace the Indigenous Americans as the wellspring of humanity. Conforming to this persuasion anthropology, as a science, manifest itself in its explanation for Native beginnings as one founded in the belief that the Americas was a "New" World, even for the Indian. Enter into this equation that the name given the "Indian" was itself derived from the understanding that they emanated east of the Indus River.

Resolution and the Art of Scientific Expression

Science, in a noble effort to bring understanding, should be more than willing to investigate alternatives when what seems obvious leads to unresolvable conclusions. Scientific investigation should offer, in its core, an openhearted search for valid explanations and alternatives when they are called for. Natives People have long accepted unknowns as "Great Mysteries" relying on the greatness of our human spirit to trick the tricksters into revealing what society needs in both time and place. For the Indian philosophical givens were rarely capricious. Truth should be bound by natural law. The Indian knew where he came from while the European 'mind' could not accept this. So it was, with this vast difference of opinion in mind, that American Archaeology would cast it's own long foreboding shadow over claims of great antiquity.

Theosophical explanations represent the best example of the confining definitions that besought 19th Century investigations into Native American origins. Born from these concepts was a religiously based prejudice that addressed the Natives presence in the Americas as "lost tribes" led away from the "promised land" at the hands of Satan. The earliest distinctly archaeological evaluation centered on the origins of the Mound Builders. These scientists challenged the Euro-centric belief that these and other earthworks were created by a more 'highly evolved' European race unrelated to the present populations of American Indians inhabiting the Mississippi.¹³ This prejudice insinuated that these "achievements" were made by more advanced European societies (a lost race) who, after creating them, were violently displaced by Indian savages. This was the prevailing attitude of-the-day though there were many who hung on long enough to prove them wrong by applying scientific methods to investigations in archaeology. By the end of the 19th Century proof that the Civilized Mound Builders were in fact Native Americans helped establish the exactness of archaeological methods as a maturing science. The discoveries and excavation of Mississippian and Hopewellian earthen mounds and evidence of other ancient "Amerindian civilizations" established that mankind's was a contemporary "rise to Civilization" not confined to Europe. Yet, we know that, despite accumulating advancements in scientific process earlier discriminations left little opportunity for an apotheosis¹⁴ of American Natives as the ancestral population from which the wellspring of humanity could be derived. If anything, a few closed-minded authorities soon took it upon themselves to denigrate the

² The term "race" belongs to this era and should, in preferential respect, not be in use today.

¹⁴ Connecting the Native American to the beginning of mankind would redefine the harmony of their discovered state as one with the Universe.

reputation of anyone willing to lay claim of great antiquity for the Native inhabitants of the Americas. This has had a tremendous impact on evolutionary theory and the lives and efforts of professional researchers to this day.

Retracing Our Steps

Examples of European dogma' run-amuck are demonstrated in the disparaging tone of some early speculations and opinions that helped set the stage and scope of future scientific investigations. The Anglo-American concept of a "Manifest Destiny" decreed the Indian Cultures inferior, who's divine rights to this land were seen as, somehow groundless. The roots of this perspective can be found in the initial religious placement of the native Indian by some, as "heathens, led astray by hand of Satan." By example, the Indian was afforded the same indignity wealthy landowners of contemporary Europe showed to the peasant classes, removing them from the land, as they too were dispensable. This indignity manifest itself in the America experience when Natives including the Cherokee became productive contributors ably adapting themselves to agrarian lifeways that included European-like settlements and Protestant churches. The "Trail of Tears" followed the active incorporation by the Cherokee of European systems, reflecting the power self imposed governments have continuously dictated when they identify lower classes and then turn on them. This aristocratic attitude carried over into the sciences, being manifest in the authoritarian values of who came first, what is savage and what is not. Many of these empirical beliefs are retained to this day though we have come to hope that it has no place in science.

The origins and antiquity of early man in the Americas was made to fit into a age that could justify the European's "Manifest Destiny", to own what others could show no deed of possession. Even though there was supporting paleontological evidence of a great antiquity for the first Americans (for one, human skulls and bones found in the tailing of the California Gold Rush), resistance to these assertions prevailed. Not, until well into the 20th Century (1935) was scientific verification of even an immediate post Ice Age settlement of the Americas confirmed. This resulted from often ignored or refuted discoveries made between 1907 and 1925 of "Clovis fluted points" With their acceptance came a new definition based on archaeological observation of an Ice Age Paleolithic hunting Culture employing "Paleoindian Traditions". The presence of these beautifully fashioned stone blades confirmed that American Indians were hunting megafauna that suddenly became extinct following the end of the Ice Age, during the Holocene epoch. Yet, other early "early man"¹⁵ discoveries remain(ed) untested, with the result leaving the question of the antiquity of Native Americans as unresolved to this day. By not testing the evidence at hand, with the methods and means that we have at our disposal today, scientists are discounting the evolutionary potential of the Earth's second largest hemisphere. Western European attitudes concerning the Native Americans and the potential of an early "early man" presence within the Americas have left, in-adequately, an academic address of the far ranging implications this long dismissed alternative offers human evolutionary science. We need only invite Cinderella to the Dance!

¹⁵ Early "early man" is a commonly used vernacular used in interpreting possible great age to both archaeological and fossil discoveries in the Americas.

Before 1840, American archeology as a scholarly entity did not exist while relative knowledge of archaeological processes, its benefits and pitfalls, were rudimentary at best.¹⁶ It was generally accepted that the New World was peopled from Asia, but beyond this there was little agreement or knowledge of how and when this migration occurred. Unrelated to this issue, but of importance in understanding the sentiment of the European mind, is the question of the origins of the Mound Builders, one of the most important investigations tackled by early American archeologists. Dr. James H. McCulloh, Jr. in works dating from 1817 to 1829, set the stage for this inquiry, arguing as he did that; the mound builders and the Indians were one and the same race. His book was unpopular in that it challenged opinions held by the “moral majority” of this day, if you will; that the early Mound Building Civilizations could not have been accomplished by the present populations of Indians.

The conjecture surrounding the idea that “Europeans were the Mound Builders” ascribed that Europeans were once living in the Americas only to have their Civilization wiped out by the Indians who currently lived in and about the mounds. These opinions detailed ideas that were held through what archeologist’s term “the speculative period” a period lasting until 1846. Alternatively, archaeology and anthropology, at the end of the 19th Century, finally resolved this issue by demonstrating that the dental traits from those buried in the Mounds closely resembled the living Native Americans inhabiting the same areas. This established, once and for all, that the human societies of the Americas were capable of civilized achievements. Indeed they built the largest earthen mounds of the world. This did not stop others from arguing that an earlier European race entered the Americas before a second wave of people, this time from Asia, replaced them. Scholars in the New World during the 70 years that followed (the classificatory-descriptive period) drew many insights while it became easier to express scientific concerns gained in evaluations and discoveries attributed to American archeological surveys.

Earlier interpretations pointing to an independent development of “civilized societies” by American Indians finally gained approval with the final say attributed to the earliest American archaeologists. In examining human remains found in the mounds, archaeologists established that the humans who built the mounds were in fact Native Americans, not Europeans. This insight led 19th Century archaeologists to finally resolve the debate, confirming that American Indian had indeed built the North American Mounds, and having done so, independently achieved their own levels of Civilization. Simply, it wasn’t until 1894 that it was established that the Mississippian and Hopewell Mound Builders were indeed American Indians and not “a lost race of Europeans” driven from their lands by the present “savage” inhabitants. Today, it is recognized that the Native American descendents of the Mound Builders had continued the same social-economic systems that were archaeo-logically verified at the end of the 19th Century.

The solution to this debate was formalized by Morgan (1876) and Bandelier (1877, 1878, 1879) and they should be credited with executing archaeological methods that finally established Native Americans as direct descendants of the Mound Builders. Willey and Sabloff suggest that in funding this important work “Cyrus Thomas of the Bureau of Ethnology was responsible for demolishing the ‘lost Mound Builder race’ hypothesis in 1894”.¹⁷

¹⁶ (Willey and Sabloff 1980)

¹⁷ Willey and Sabloff 1974

Science and Objectivity: the Origins of Inquiry

Greek scholars (through the corroboration of scientific and mythological explanation), placed structure to the distinct forces of nature that bind the world's systems. During the 19th -Century formation of early anthropological thought physical and cultural elements pertaining to human origins found new definitions in science. Archaeology confirms absolute physical evidence of human settlement while anthropology draws from these discoveries genetic, linguistic, and behavioral implications. Both disciplines represent mankind's quest to bring meaning to the past by identifying hypothesis and developing paradigms that in the end leads to the building of theories. Theories remain the basis for how Great Mysteries are given definition.

In Europe the discovery of fossil remains of both archaic Neandertals and modern Cro-Magnon peoples helped fix the limits of anthropologic thought, defining it in European terms. Similar discoveries in Asia of *Homo erectus* accompanied by their recent and sudden replacement by *Homo sapiens* seemed to fit into the emerging Euro-scientific picture of a missing link into full humanness from what certainly was a separate species.¹⁸ Conformity in anthropology was, and continues to be, based on the Western European conviction that has most often been traced to their—and our, if you happen to be of European descent—own continents paleontological discoveries.

The fact remains that the initial discovery of fossil evidence of archaic Neandertals and fully modern Cro-Magnon Man in Europe did not predate the discovery of fossilized finds of *Homo sapiens* in the New World. These discoveries, many resulting from the search for gold in California where numerous and included finds in association with now extinct fauna. For many, including Alfred R. Wallace, Florentino Ameghino, and J. D. Whitney, these discoveries indicating that modern man's antiquity in the Americas could be much greater than that of the modern Cro-Magnons of Europe (~40,000 years). Unfortunately investigations of an earlier presence for modern man in the Americas did not fit into the emerging picture emanating from the Old World. It remains clear that Wallace, Ameghino, and Whitney initiated a debate that was not sanctioned because it did not include the principal component of an earlier descendant from what were believed to be older specimens of *Homo erectus*. From its earliest inception the belief of an autochthonous Amerindian origin challenged the elementary theories emanating from within the European scientific community. European distracters had their own American disciples, among them, Ales Hrdlicka and Henry Holmes, who remained undaunted in their challenge to any attempt to validate an “early ‘early man’” presence of the Americas, as it came to be called.

American avocational archaeologists and the interpretations of an early “early man” presence in the Americas created a difficult alternative to paradigms derived from European discoveries of Pleistocene occupations made by “trained” archaeologists. Certainly, substantial evidence of an advanced Paleolithic record exists earlier in Europe, one that challenges scientists to accept the limited archaeological evidence corresponding with a limited use of stone tools technologies as implied from New World pre-Clovis Pleistocene occupations. The progression of man's use of stone tools in the Old World

¹⁸ Eugene Dubois 1894 discovery in Java of *Pithecanthropus erectus* (upright ape-man) confirmed the intercontinental radiation of the African hominid now known as *Homo erectus*. It was Dubois who gave this distinct species its formal name. Asian *Homo erectus* and the Neandertals of Europe share a common line of decandancy from an earlier African ancestor.

suggests that two separate levels of behavior correspond with later and earlier forms of Homo, *sapiens* with Upper Paleolithic and *erectus* with Middle Paleolithic. The Middle and Upper Paleolithic Industries of Europe represent the best preserved Old World examples of these two levels of stone age activities. The Middle Paleolithic and associated Mousterian Industries date to the subsequent replacement of Neandertals while Upper Paleolithic industries, found in association with fully modern Cro-Magnon Man, indicate that, for the first time, modern human “cultured” behaviors have matured. The fact is that a corresponding Paleolithic or Stone Age can not be found in the Americas (before the end of the last Ice Age), making it difficult to decipher America’s pre-Clovis stage. Although rudimentary, the selection of raw materials (wood, bone, and naturally modified stones) most often used as tools, during the American pre-Clovis should not require we dismiss the association with human endeavor. Simply dismissing them because lithic components of a similar Old World nature are not found in the pre-Clovis archaeological contexts negates the fact that human cultures survived and/or even flourished with such pre-supposed limited devises.

The fossil-man discoveries and interpretations drawn from Europe center on a line of progression, from one species to the next, instead of on the discovery of two separate species of hominids with contrasting behaviors. The more recent activities associated with fully modern human sapient occupations, marking the dawn of Upper Paleolithic Europe, demonstrate a highly evolved “cultured” lifeway. This is evidenced by the depiction’s from cave paintings and associated artifacts suggesting a clear affinity with advanced hunter/gathering organization. The Neandertals on the other hand, are believed to be less than human, unable to articulate and/or appreciate the world in the ways associated with the more articulate Cro-Magnons.

Most, if not all of the earlier paleontological record associated with the Neandertals were found in cave deposits. The fragmentary record of the skulls and bones associated with theses finds suggested that cannibalism may have been a practiced by the earliest hominids of Europe. The ineptitude of Neandertals to remove their own decaying remains from the living areas of these caves (along with other primarily scavenged food sources) may have, as a result, contributed to the vast numbers of remains found of these hominids. This inability to keep their caves clean left for today’s paleontologists a greater number of preserved remains of their kind leading to more numerous discoveries.

There were so many discoveries of Neandertal remains in association with excavations of collapsed caves that many Paleontologists simply discarded them. It must be understood that most early scholars were un-convinced that these non-sapient forms had anything to do with the more recent deposits of our own ancestors, anatomically modern Homo *sapiens*.¹⁹ Many anthropologists believed a missing link, separating Neandertals and modern humans, untenable. The discovery of Piltdown Man in 1912 tabled any other prevailing theory and with it alternatives that might have included the Americas in the search for sapien pre-genitors.

The discovery of Piltdown Man forced European anthropologists to explain with fossil evidence, the shift from one species to another. We know today that there is no evidence for this shift as Piltdown had led many to believe. Certainly, the earliest interpretation of a missing link between Homo *erectus* and anatomically modern Homo *sapiens* has changed little, if any, to this day. That is, the anatomy of modern humans has

¹⁹ Kollman and Keith

remained stable from the time we first arrived in Europe (~ 40,000 years ago). The European evidence suggests that mankind's physiology pre-dates any relationship that would link us to archaic European Neandertals or any other Old World population be they African or Asian, relation of *Homo erectus*. Evidence of replacement for the Neandertal—from an out-of-European source—is sustained in archaeological and paleontological evidence drawn from the 19th and 20th Century. This perspective remains the dominant paradigm, suggesting as it does, by definition of “replacement”, that modern man migrated into Europe from elsewhere.

The picture archaeologists and paleontologists are able to draw of anatomically modern humans and their Upper Paleolithic occupations is most often derived from habitations in open air sites. The ability of archaeologists to define modern occupations are enhanced by the preservation of lithic stone tools. The observance of hearths, and evidence of long-term occupation helps define the character of these clearly advanced hunter/gatherer societies. Cave paintings depicting the life and times of the last European Ice Age represent accurate historical translations of the world of Upper Paleolithic Europe. However, since excavations of Cro-Magnon habitations rarely produce actual fossil remains, it could be presumed, burials were not made in or about the immediate living areas.

Scholars remain remiss to include the American Indians as a source for the Cro-Magnons although Carbon 14 dating can now be drawn to support that the dawn of the Upper Paleolithic began in southern Siberia. Discoveries in this the northern limits of *Homo erectus* migrations may reveal the Old Worlds first encounter between *Homo sapiens* and *Homo erectus*. This location points us back towards Beringia, to what Native Americans call “the backdoor out of the Americas”. Could the bone tools found in Alaska at Old Crow that pre-date the Asian Late Paleolithic have been derived from an earlier reliance on pre-Clovis industries? Does this procession help explain why the first modern tool kits of Central Asia pre-date Europe's Upper Paleolithic?²⁰ The fact is the furthest radiations of the Mousterian Middle Paleolithic are found outside of Europe in western Siberia where progenitors of the Upper Paleolithic, dating to 43,000, first appear. Did encounters in southern Siberia between Amerindians and Neandertals influence *Homo sapiens* in developing lithic tools? Archaeological definitions and dates associated with the advent of the Upper Paleolithic can be found here, in the Russian Near East, where the first encounters of modern humans and Neandertals occurred. If *Homo erectus* groups did not migrate beyond western Siberia the first evidence of modern human stone tool use might be found above where Mousterian Industries came closest to the Americas. It could be reasoned that contact between the two species helped initiate the modern human Upper Paleolithic.²¹

Americanists are now beginning to interpret pre-Paleoindian Traditions although few, if any, advocate that the bone or stone tools, associated with the mid-Pleistocene Amerindian occupations, were precursors to evolving Old World Upper Paleolithic

²⁰ Leannova 1993; Otte M. and A. Derevianko 1996

²¹ Comprehensive C-14 dates from the Russian Far East and Siberia have now been published (Kuzman and Orlova, 1998). They represent the oldest C-14 dating of the Upper Paleolithic anywhere in the world. *Homo erectus* migrations out of Africa into Europe and Asia and finally, into Siberia pre-dates the first encounters between them and AMHS. Is it coincidence that the first advancements leading to the Upper Paleolithic occurred when and where the two species first encounter one-another?

Industries. Elementary stone tools found by early Americanists, including C. C. Abbott, were argued as evidence of a human stage that, in scientific terms, did not compliment the European discoveries. Clearly, the European Upper Paleolithic record affiliated with anatomically modern human began at the dawn of the last Ice Age (~43-38,000 y.b.p.) while similar sophisticated stone age tools are not found in the Americas until the end of the Last Ice age (~12,000 y.b.p.). As stated earlier, the evidence from Europe indicates that advancements made in the Old World did not find their way to the New until Paleoindian Traditions and hunting industries begin to appear. Why the delay?

There is no doubt that Paleoindian Traditions are associated with Upper Paleolithic subsistence strategies. They occur near the end of last Ice Age while archeological definitions supporting earlier than 12,000 year old Amerindian habitations show few, if any, links with advanced Old World Stone Age hunting technologies. The argument that there were “pre-projectile point industries” in the Americas before the end of the last glacial age 12,000 years ago must contend that advancements gained in the exploration of the Old World were geographically isolated from the original ancestors of those people, the Amerindians. The subsistence behaviors of pre-Clovis peoples did not include Upper Paleolithic industries since bone and wood age tools associated with the earliest Amerindian cultures mandates that systematic hunting was not an integral or even elementary element of their (and our) earliest ancestors lifeways.

Clues from the Old World

The morphological characteristics that separate *Homo sapiens* from *Homo erectus* were long ago used to augment suggestions of a transition between Cro-Magnon Man and Neanderthals. Today these earlier opinions are still widely accepted while little if any evidence gathered over the past 100 years used to champion “Sudden Replacement” actually supports the Procrustean transition Multi-regional theorists suppose. Yet, anthropologists convinced of a transitional evolution from one species to another, “Multi-Regional Evolution”, continue to share the limelight as Sudden Replacement proponents have failed to look to the Americas.

Fossil support for widespread migrations of *Homo erectus* throughout the Old World has established that this species was the first hominid to colonize the Eastern Hemisphere. But this exploration did not include the Western Hemisphere, where *Homo sapiens* remained, themselves, isolated. Thus, the first hominids to occupy more than one continent in the *Old World* were indeed the descendants of Africa's *Homo erectus*. Dubois discovery of Java Man in 1891 was later used to support Multiregional evolution although Dubois, sometimes argued that Java Man held no special relationship to modern man. Scientific opinion can identify a lack of affinities between *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapiens*, but they are countered by early proponents of what would become “Multi-regional Evolution” (it's first champion being Franz Weidenreich). The alternative model supported by Keith, Kollman, and Wallace was of “replacement” from a then unknown source.

1912 and the Piltdown Hoax

Piltdown skull was proven a hoax in 1952 following the Carbon 14 dating of the jaw and skull, once believed the missing link between man and ape. European scientists involved in this so-called discovery identified, for decades to come, that the Euro-centric view

housed the scientific validation of human evolutionary theory. The Sudden-Replacement hypothesis continues to wallow in the Old World for a single location for the transition to modern human forms and behaviors. Yet, seldom, if ever, do these advocates address the Americas.

Several noted scientists have been attributed to the planting of the Orangutan jaw and the acid treated human skull found in the Ice Age gravel's. Among those was Sir Arthur Keith, although I for one could not conclude that his earlier arguments; on the relative stability of the modern human form, would not be furthered by such a "plant".

Pitldown Quote

Keith's views were representative of a fraternity of early anthropologists, maintaining a modern human link between Neandertals and Cro-Magnons had little, if any, morphological, anatomical, or cranio-logical support. In fact, many early anthropologists would often discard to the museum closets, Neandertal remains, considering the brutish ape-like hominid far-removed from the family of man. Julius Kollman was another apostate willing to argue that the modern human anatomy dated far beyond the modern human arrival into Europe, comparing them more favorably to specimens gathered from the New World fossil record to bolster his argument.

Although the earliest theoretical interpretations identified that a single separate origin for modern humans was implicitly supported by the paleontological data, a New World source for this the modern human species remained outside the general scope of investigative research strategies. Yet, we could re-evaluate of the cultural propensity and social structure of Amerindian societies as the root of the human evolutionary tree. In an attempt to place the aboriginal American Indians into a new version of the Bible, Adam Smith and Brigham Young may have accurately interpreted the role the American Indian held. They argued that the Garden of Eden was in Missouri and that the descendants of Adam and Eve were Laminites who left the Americas to populate the Old World. Laminites, were also left behind in their primitive state, lost tribes predating those recorded in the Biblical translations of the early Israelites.

We can see that historical translations held in Biblical accounts helped guide not only early religious interpretations of the indigenous, but also, scientific evaluations attempting to confirm that highly evolved societies were generated from lesser, more primitive "savagery". In attributing the movement of man into the Americas as a "Peopling event" the philosophical given of an Asian origin was established. Scientific investigations of the day came to accept this philosophical given since it was unpopular to believe or conceive that American Indians actually settled the Indus River after leaving the Americas. Yet, many scientific investigators found contentious the notion that we were directly related to *Homo erectus*, later Neanderthals, and/or Java Man. They argued that the anatomy of the Cro-Magnon's was itself a highly evolved condition pre-dating their Ice Age arrival in Europe. Still, the Americas remained overlooked as a possible evolutionary source for "when man first was".

Numerous examples can be found suggesting that philosophical givens bias the outcome, even when building theory. The growth of scientific knowledge might best be advanced by re-examining the roots of pre-determined judgments and estimates that have been overshadowed, less we forestall a resolution and starve those of us seeking real

solutions. Today, this argument is rarely identified or anticipated in seeking answers to questions scientists ask about human origins.

The history of the debate concerning human origins has been shaped by the philosophical and sometimes theological interpretations that guide Euro-centric opinion. By building a theory that incorporates an autochthonous origin for the American Indian we are establishing that a new paradigm can be drawn from accumulating data. We will see that the key pieces of this puzzle are, in fact, identified with finally hewed edges that incorporate a vivid picture of earthly origin that began in the Americas. The challenge is to overcome the limitations and sometimes desperate models that have forestalled an investigation into this far reaching alternative wellspring. The comparison it presents would distinguish the origins of humankind with an even more recent “Peopling event” that of the Eastern Hemisphere.

European criticisms of many Americanists (their interpretations, purporting an early “early man” presence), centered on their avocational standing and the seemingly outrageous claims for great antiquity made for the American Indian. While some (but not all) of these criticisms may have had merit the accusations went far beyond the scope of scientific debate. This delayed an openhearted investigation into the alternatives and may have dismissed them for the simple reason that; they challenged European evidence by redirecting human evolutionary theory. By the time Paleoindian Traditions and an Ice Age presence was finally accepted (1936) the origin of man had fallen into the definitions purported in the academic alliance supporting Piltdown Man. This British discovery, and proclamation of an Englishman as the ancestor for modern humans, remained at the forefront of anthropological theory until 1952 when Carbon-14 tests established that the human skull was less than 600 years old. It was later determined that the jaw, found in association with a fossilized human skullcap, was that of an orangutans. In 1952 began the search for the perpetrator of the hoax, not the effects it had in deterring the direction of anthropologic thought. Science can be a slow and methodical process, confounded by bias and misinterpretation, and an unwillingness to advocate retracing our steps when confusion occurs.

CHAPTER IV. SCIENCE TACKLES: THE ORIGINS OF THE NATIVE AMERICAN

We will identify within this book an orientation that is founded in Amerindian perspectives. Their worldly view retains what were the original instructions, based on the vivid use of myth and storytelling and their retention of these values in the lives they led. These perspectives were provided to European benefactors including George Catlin, Henry Morgan, Charles Lummis, and Franz Boas before the turn-of-the-Century. But there were pragmatists, none more contemptuous than Alex Hrdlicka, who was proven wrong but not until the end of his life when the damage he had done had just began to mend. Hrdlicka was a major player at the turn-of-the-Century and must be addressed in this context. He felt and acted as if he was in charge of the American science of human

origins holding a definitive role in defining for anyone who wished advancement, that the antiquity of the Indian was less than a thousand years. The initial conservative opinions for the age of the Native Americans led many Americanists to step softly around discoveries for reason that they might draw the wrath of Hrdlicka or the prevailing voices he led. This partiality compromised (and continues to this day), anthropological interpretations of Native American antiquity in the “New World.”

William Henry Holmes based at the National Museum in the Bureau of American Ethnology succeeded Major Wesley Powell as Chief of the Bureau in 1902. Holmes study of the so-called Trenton Paleoliths, led him to conclude that these implements were actually rejects of more recent craftsmen. He became convinced that man did not reach the New World until after the Pleistocene and that the Nicaraguan footprints and other propertyed indications of early “early Man” had no theory to accompany their evidence. The age of many of these discoveries remain in limbo today, unresolved finds that have the right to be placed in their proper space and time after, in many cases, a century or more of neglect.

Ales Hrdlicka, the most persistent detractor of early “early man” evidence from the Americas, was trained as an anthropologist in Europe coming to the National Museum in 1903. An advocate of today’s Multiregional Model Hrdlicka challenged seemingly every Early Man find (and associated skeletal material as not being primitive in appearance) discovered in the early part of the 20th Century. His relentless criticisms challenged the viability of any of these finds, basing his criticisms of them as the result of amateur discoveries, sloppy techniques during excavations, and/or the modern appearance of the skeletal remains in question.

By the turn of the century the Americanists had been subjected to a great deal of criticism concerning their work and their interpretations for the problems they presented in challenging the paradigms founded in the Old World descent of Man. There was, of course, some merit in the concerns aired by the pragmatists, yet an investigation into enigmas unearthed by American archaeologists remain unresolved to this day. The furtherance of archaeological method and theory was advanced in the criticisms surrounding early endeavors while the subsequent procedural progress drawn from these criticisms likened a more conservative analysis. The fraternity of turn-of-the-century anthropologists and archaeologists, in challenging the early work of the Americanists, were so merciless that it became a virtual taboo to forward any discovery suggesting great antiquity.

“Frank H. H. Roberts has stated, an atmosphere of fear pervaded the Early Man scene, with many workers afraid to face Hrdlicka’s scathing attacks. ‘The question of early man in America became virtually taboo, and no anthropologist, or for that matter geologist or paleontologist, desirous of a successful career would tempt the fate of ostracism by intimating that he had discovered indications of a respectable antiquity for the Indian’ (Roberts, 1940, p. 52).

The consequences of this fervent mind-set left in its wake a climate of fear that has yet to be overcome. In outlining the history of this idea, it should be recorded that academic pursuits suggesting that this idea could be validated have been resoundingly stultified.

The history of archaeology, in it’s scientific form, begins in the Americas near the end of the 19th Century. The discoveries of ancient “Amerindian civilizations” including

the excavation of Mississippian and Hopewellian Mounds helped set the stage for a scientific inquisition into “Indian” societies and their “primitive” social systems. Archaeological interpretations of the 19th Century needed to adhere to European perspectives. Henry Morgan in the mid 19th Century, following his studies of the Iroquois, established that mankind’s cultural foundations could be traced back to a system defined in three stages; savagery, barbarianism, and civilization. Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages. These ancestral stages were seen to exist in the American cultures that 19th Century anthropology was beginning to define.

Mankind’s development is bound by evolutionary processes paralleling the formation of other life forms on planet earth. Anthropological science, in an attempt to decipher our own human relationships, has followed a course that has led to further research. This book will identify for the reader a separate place for our modern predecessors, by defining the evolutionary significance of the current assessment that defines Neandertals and Cro-Magnons as entirely separate species. Our familiarity with European discoveries and subsequent evolutionary parameters are best understood from this Western European perspective. Yet, each separate continent has its own evidence and definitions that are themselves analogous with European explanations and the limits they define.

Science and the study of man (anthropology) may trace it’s roots to Europe but we believe, not her ancestors. Although this has proven acceptable to most researchers²² the current dilemma requires that the ancestors of the first fully modern human European (a.k.a., Cro-Magnon People), originated outside of Europe itself. While we can accept this today, this has not always been the case. We need only look to the Piltdown Hoax to establish that the science of our past was more-than-willing to adopt any evidence that might prove this the case. Piltdown Man was indeed a hoax, a fabrication that caused researchers to adopt a human skull attached to a modified orangutan jaw as the solution to our missing link to an earlier pre-human past. Even some of the staunchest advocates of the stability or “continuity of the modern human form over time”, were persuaded (coaxed) into believing the first Modern People were British. This, by acquiescing to the theory that accompanied the “discovery” of Piltdown Man.

From 1912 to 1952, when C-14 dating established Piltdown Man as a hoax, anthropologists were often constrained to include this possibility against the growing evidence drawn not only from outside Europe, but Europe itself. To-this-day, anthropologists find it difficult to account for the abrupt changes in Old World hominid forms and attitudes and the suddenly dramatic presence of modern humans little more than 40,000 years ago. Except for minor environmental adaptations such as skin pigmentation there has been little or no change in these *new* anatomically modern humans. Like most contemporary sciences, anthropology is a product of European tradition. This is no more better evidenced than when we remember that the discovery of Piltdown Man in 1912 led many British scientists to believe modern man evolved in Britain. Later revelations in the 1950's proved that Piltdown man was an elaborate hoax, an acid-treated human skull and an orangutan jaw.

“Drawing from memory, Thomas Jefferson postulated in 1816 that the diversity of Native American languages was such, ‘...that the tribes speaking them could not

²² however see, Wolpoff, Thorn, Wu, Wiendenrick and others, ibed.

possibly understand one another.' From this observation, he estimated that native Americans had lived long enough in the Americas to be the parent stock of Asian peoples!."23

Of course Jefferson was well aware of Acosta's original depiction of a migration from Asia across the Bering Land Bridge but that did not constrict his ability to contemplate alternatives as seen here.

Another advocate of autochthonous origin was Charles Lummis, a photographer/cultural anthropologist who's work spanned the turn-of-the-19th-century. His collections set the stage for the foundation for the Southwest Museum of the American Indian. He believed that vast differences in linguistic and cultural affinities defining individual tribal societies in the American Southwest hinted at an antiquity that could predate man's Ice Age presence in Europe (~40,000 years ago).24 He too is credited with adopting the indigenous belief that Native Americans have always been here though he did not allude to this in his writings as much as he might have wished, choosing to avoid committing professional suicide. This hesitancy reflected his concern that addressing scientific taboos might adversely effect insights into his cultural observations. He was one of many who were careful to tread on the centrist view though he strongly believed in the truth contained in the cultural substructure of those he studied.

Franz Boas, as leader of the Jesup Expedition's study of the Northwest Pacific Coast, Eskimo-Aleut, and Siberian Peoples, was able to examine the structure of adjacent but isolated indigenous societies. Boas found that separate Chiefdoms could be best understood with the paralleling of different languages and myths and from that the foundation of each tribe's cultural beliefs. Boas and his colleagues, in separate examinations, were able to establish that language, motifs, and symbolic mythical relationships could be traced to the Americas and not Asia. J. Farrand, in the course of his study of the Bella Bella Chiefdoms, was told by Omai'g'a, an 87 year old elder, of the geographic elements known from the story of their origins.

"In the beginning there was but water and ice, and a narrow strip of shoreline."
(from *Bella Bella Tales*; Franz Boas, 1938)

This short narrative as told in 1897 exemplifies the value of mythic translation, as it accurately describes immediate post-glacial (Holocene) conditions along the Northwest Pacific Coast, circa 10-12 thousand years. Native American stories carry with them untold accounts of the past and in-keeping aboriginal teachings, the representation of accurate translations of their world. Similarities between Siberians and Native Americans was seen, by Boas and others assimilating data during the Jesup Expedition (1897 - 1902), as to be from the Americas.25 This perspective was virtually ignored and caused a rift between Boas and Ales Hrdicka. This conflict led Boas to become, primarily, a data collector, reluctant to draw definitive conclusions less he draw the wrath of Hrdicka's contempt. The science of anthropology lost, from this indeterminacy, valuable insights that should have confirmed Boas hypothesis of "back-migration". This defensive posture

²³ Dr. Donald Grinde, *personal notes*

²⁴ From *Smithsonian Magazine*, 1993

²⁵ Boas 1905 and 1910

left Boas to his primacy, that as a data collector, though many consider him “the father of American anthropology”.

From discussions with George Carter and Alan Bryan, prominent advocates of an early “early man” presence in the Americas (but not an American genesis), I was directed to the century old works of Argentina’s Florentino Ameghino. Ameghino, a self taught paleontologist had no equal in his time (1854 to 1911). His most controversial find was of an early primate he gave the name “Homunculus patagonicus.” He believed that the evolving anatomy found in this 32 million year old fossil primate eventually led to the earliest ancestors of *Homo sapiens*, indigenous American Indians, and with them today’s Old World Human descendants. Ameghino’s evolutionary interpretation was not the first perspective to embrace Native Americans as the ancestors of Old World humans. He may have been the first true paleontologist to endorse the view that mankind descended from within the Higher Primate family of the New World.

Predilection and Consensus: Roots to the Enigma

European perspectives—concerning Mankind’s “rise to Civilization”—were prejudiced by an inferior view many held for the Native people of the Americas. Even so, there were those who believed otherwise. Henry Morgan in the mid 19th Century, during his study of the Iroquois, suggested that man’s cultural foundations could be traced back to a system defined by three stages; savagery, barbarianism, and civilization. Burgeoning anthropologists found that these stages could be found in differing examples of Native American cultures, and so it seemed that they were ideal candidates to study the Europeans own “rise to Civilization”. Anthropology, a dawning science in the 19th Century, was beginning to define the origins of human social behavior and the Americas offered a living example from which Europeans could measure their own cultural beginnings. The Indians represented an ideal population from which the European might better understand their own “savage” origins.

In 1850’s Alfred Russell Wallace, following in the ‘wake’ of Charles Darwin, began an investigation of New World biota including its Higher Primates. We should remember that the greatest question leading to the adoption of “natural selection” as the vehicle leading to today’s species was; where did our own progenitor species originate. As a footnote to Wallace’s later work in Borneo are his years of research in South America that were lost when the ship carrying him and his work sank off the coast of Brazil. Wallace obviously survived and returned to England where he was able to (after considerable efforts), gain further funding that later took him to Sumatra and the Island of Borneo.

It was in Borneo that Wallace (in a state of delirium, the result of contracting Yellow Fever), crawled from his cot and scratched down the notes that later led Darwin to adopt the critical conclusion that swayed the opinion of scientists and layman of that era; that the cause for change was, “natural selection.” In the years that followed this scientific discovery anthropology began as a science, focusing on our own origins. The primary issues of that day centered on the scientific discoveries of *earlier* Neandertals and *later* Cro-Magnons and the anthropological implications surrounding the European evidence. Clearly, the same problems that are equated to today’s debate were first identified at the dawn of anthropology.

These problems centered on the fossil evidence in Europe that suggested then (and now) that modern humans do not predate the Neandertals. Alternative explanations suggested that either modern man descended from Neandertals in a punctuated form of evolution or that our modern progenitors replaced them thus requiring an origin outside of Europe. Wallace favored the later since he and others (who, in the 19th Century, were in the majority) believed that the human anatomy had remained stable far longer than modern man's presence in Europe suggested. That is, Wallace and others believed we were not the descendants of Europe's first hominids, the Neandertals.

At the same time fossil evidence suggesting a great Native American antiquity in the Americas were being uncovered (Whitney 1879). These "early, early man" finds (as they came to be called), from the Americas were left in a state of limbo with little if any interest in determining the significance of their potential antiquity. Though there were proponents of an autochthonous origin for the American Indian (Ameghino 1989; Chamberlain 1912; Abbot 1912; Sidis 1915 unpublished material), and Fitzgerald 1930, the issues surrounding the possibility of great antiquity centered on their likeness to the later Cro-Magnons and not the more ancient Europeans, the Neandertals.

The suggestions of a greater antiquity for the modern human form than that that was suggested from the European evidence was difficult for Europeanists to swallow. It should be recalled that it was not until 1895 that the ancestors of the Mississippian and Hopewellian Mound Builder Societies were accepted as Native Americans. It had long been proposed that these supposed lost European civilizations were brutally replaced by savage Indian populations of the Day. Clearly, the climate in anthropological circles at the turn-of-the-Century was not ripe for hypothesis suggesting the wellspring of the Europeans could have been spawned in the Americas. I can attest that this persuasion remains intact today.

At the turn-of-the-Century fossil primate finds were championed as potential precursors to humans. Its leading advocate, Argentinean paleontologist, Florentino Ameghino, was considered in his time the leading authority in his field, at least in South America where he and his brother Carlos gathered everything from early primates to extinct dinosaurs. By the time of Ameghino's death in 1912 the British anthropological community had begun to accept "Piltdown Man" as the missing link between Neandertals and Cro-Magnon's. This left in its wake other alternatives of the time including Ameghino's. In 1952, following the development of carbon -14 dating in the 1940's, "Piltdown Man" became "the Piltdown Hoax" and the debate on human origins began, for some, anew. Yet, the "measure of man" continued to dismiss the American Indian as a potential source for Old World *Homo sapiens*, continuing to adopt the perspective that the American Indian race should continue to be traced back into Asia (Coon 1960).

The conventional wisdom that ordains this limiting view of the antiquity of man in the Americas continued(s) to define an Asian origin for the Amerindians as a given since, 1) fossil finds of the first Americans show no affinities that would link them to the "more ancient breeds of man" known in the Old World to have preceded the "modern" types, 2) there are no living apes (hominoids) in the Americas from which to evolve humans from -- as it is assumed for Old World hominids, 3) there remain difficult archaeological interpretations to be drawn from the American mid-Pleistocene record (sites > 11,900 y.b.p.) that, to this day, constrain the acceptance of Amerindians as a contemporary population to that of the Upper Paleolithic Cro-Magnons of Europe, 4)

professional anthropologists have been un-willing to risk their reputations in designing hypothesis to support an autochthonous Amerindian origin, while 5) any attempts to redefine the opinions held by turn-of-the-Century advocates and scholars are seen as outrageous, although there are scholars who have taken exception including the late Bruce Raemsch.²⁶

The design of this paper is to provide an alternative explanation as to why Platyrrhini (the New World members of the Higher Primate family; Haplorhini) should not be omitted from the search for American Indian origins and subsequently, the rest of humanity. What is known from the archaeological and fossil record of the Old World is that our Pleistocene ancestors 45,000 years ago began to replace *Homo erectus* hominids, known to have originated in Africa well over a million years ago. That these "invaders" could have come from the Americas has long been dismissed (or ignored). We will cast new light to this idea.

We could call this idea the 'Amerindian Eve Hypothesis,' in contrast to the "Out of Africa" or "Eve Hypothesis". Both hypotheses that suggest, from mtDNA analysis, a recent (40,000 year old) replacement of earlier, *Homo erectus* populations, who are known from fossil finds to have first evolved from African hominids. Certainly there is considerable support from mitochondrial DNA studies for a recent arrival of modern humans throughout the Old World. In contrasting the genetic substructure it can be said that the antiquity suggested from mtDNA studies of New World Tribal populations supports a much greater antiquity.²⁷ This theory attempts to trace human origins to a progenitor primate species few have been willing to address, those of the New World. A shift into a new paradigm is best accomplished by iconoclasts. Such is the nature of scientific revolutions, this one heralded by the continuing impasse constraining evolutionary anthropology. In re-searching this alternative we must be willing to chance the last bastion of unexplored ideas central to the anthropological consensus, that of an Earthly origin for mankind from primate ancestors.

V. Theory Building: The Key to Scientific Validation

The most informative and comprehensive book covering the subject of human origins (from a paleontological point of view), is Smith/Spencer's (editors), *The Origins of Modern Humans: A World survey of the Fossil Evidence*. Written in 1984, it remains the definitive work on the subject of human and pre-human paleontological evidence. This book was used by this author to lay the foundation for my early research and, as well, the alternatives represented in; Anishinaabe. Smith/Spencer (1984) definitive work was instrumental in assessing the discoveries and theories that support differing opinions concerning human evolutionary concepts. It will be used as the ultimate source for distinguishing the limitations of evidence that are perceived to support an Old World paleontological origin for modern man and/or in defining the limitations this perspective has long acknowledged.

²⁶ 1990

²⁷ (Ward et al. 1991 and others)

The primary hypotheses identified in Smith/Spencer revolve around two conflicting hypotheses. These are defined by their authors as “Multi-Regional Evolution” and the “Rapid Replacement” hypotheses. Both propose a recent ancestry for modern humans. Multi-Regionalists propose several regional speculation events with modern humans evolving from isolated continental *Homo erectus* populations while the proponents of the Rapid-Replacement hypothesis suggest a single location for the initiation of our species. Yet, while the lack of a consensus exists, the formation of these separate evolutionary theories demonstrates that the issues defining the origin of *Homo sapiens*, remains unresolved. The basic tenants of these conflicting theories will be further outlined in the next chapter. Moreover, the reader will be enlightened as to the surprisingly positive insights this debate offers in highlighting the Out of the Americas alternative and in setting the scope for the reinvestigation of this lost paradigm.

In the last chapter of Smith/Spencer, Roger Owen discusses the fossil and archaeological evidence and theories concerning the initial peopling of the Americas. Drawing primarily from the work of archaeologists, Owen ties together for the reader the details that identify the consensus opinion of-the-day; that the presence of mankind in the Americas most likely dates to less than 12,000 years before the present. He does so while virtually ignoring the efforts of the minority consensus, those discovering greater than 12,000 year old occupations in the Americas. Owen argues that theories supporting pre-Clovis occupations are unfounded, primarily because archaeological proof supporting earlier than Clovis technologies are not up-to-snuff with Paleoindian Traditions. They are surprisingly difficult to define but this requires a new approach. The debate centers on the problem of interpreting the lifestyles of pre-Clovis Amerindians not in ignoring their significance. Simply, lithic or stone hunting tools and refined stone age Upper Paleolithic technologies, known to exist in the Old World 30,000 years earlier, are missing in these, as he sees it, “proposed” human occupations. Lacking a thorough explanation for why Upper Paleolithic like technologies is no reason to throw the baby out with the bath-water. Know-one considers the possibility that pre-Clovis Amerindians could have been isolated from the Old World advancements gained during the intercontinental dispersal of our species throughout the Eastern Hemisphere.

Age and Archaeological terms identifying *Homo sapiens* occupations

Location:	Africa	Asia	Europe	Australia
Age:	< 36,150 ybp	< 39,200 ybp	< 38, 350 ybp	< 39,000
Designation:	Later Stone Age	Late Paleolithic	Upper Paleolithic	Late Paleolithic

Age and Archaeological terms identifying *Homo erectus* occupations

Location:	Africa	Asia	Europe	Australia
Age:	> 36,500 ybp	> 39,200 ybp	> 38, 350 ybp	uninhabited
Designation:	Auchulian, Early Stone Age	Middle Paleolithic	Mousterian, Middle Paleolithic	uninhabited

The terms above correspond with archaeological data defining “regional” occupations for both *Homo sapiens* and *Homo erectus*. For example, terms that define *Homo erectus* occupations are referred to in Europe as Middle Paleolithic, while modern human occupations are archaeologically referred to in Europe as Upper Paleolithic habitations. In Africa the “European” Middle Paleolithic equivalent is called the “Early Stone Age” while anatomically modern human occupations that follow it are termed “Later Stone Age”. The Later Stone Age of Africa is virtually contemporaneous with the European Upper Paleolithic and Asian Late Paleolithic. Archaeological dates older than 40,000 years ago belong to *Homo erectus* occupations and may overlap into the modern record before total replacement occurred. In Europe there are occupations where *Homo erectus* incorporated tools used by modern Upper Paleolithic people. These sites belonging to the Neandertal are termed “Chalchertonian”. It is my intention to make clear these terms and their relationships in space and time. These definitions identify specific limits and evolutionary frameworks used in outlining the archaeological timeframes before and just preceding the “sudden replacement” of *Homo erectus* by *Homo sapiens sapiens*.

Mankind’s cultural foundations and attitudes concerning the designation of race and their separate origins, have been redirected today by the scientific verification that all of us descended from a common ancestral population. We will see that both genetic and archaeological data is establishing the suddenness of a replacement of earlier Old World hominids as a fact. It will be highlighted throughout this book that the source origin for our modern human forebear’s remains unknown only because science is a conservative venture and will not include evolutionary designs embodying New World members of the Higher primate family into the debate. A new course, for what is an old paradigm, can be found by setting our scope on earlier turn-of-the-century perspectives that also championed an autochthonous (in-situ) origin for humans from within the Western Hemisphere. Sighting the works of Ameghino, Wallace, Lummis, Chamberlain, Sidis, Raemsch, and others, this predilection will cast new light through the incorporation of over a hundred and forty years of anthropological scientific investigations.

Fossils Man and Footprints: Tracing Clues of Early *Homo Sapiens* in the Americas

The possibility that the 19th century finds of human cultural and fossil remains in the Auriferous gravels of the California gold fields could be of Tertiary age (then estimated at 500,000 y.b.p.) was, at the time, unthinkable. Later, European traditionalists, including William Henry Holmes and Ales Hrdlicka, in their persistent attacks against those making these kinds of interpretations, were themselves defining the general outlines of pre-human and human evolution and using them to argue against any New World claims of great antiquity. The initial as well as the later traditional Europeans simply echoed the interpretations emanating from Europe and that continent’s own contemporary discovery of Neandertals and Cro-Magnons. In fact, the initial discoveries of European fossil hominids in 1856 did not precede the fossil man discoveries resulting from the mid 19th century quarrying of gold in the California Sierra Nevada foothills. The ensuing analysis, suggesting a post-transitional or fully modern human presence of “Tertiary Age” was undertaken by J. D. Whitney (1872 and 1879), State Surveyor for the California Geologic Survey Office. This work continued under William Henry Holmes through the turn of the

century (1899). Because they provided an unacceptable target advocates of the consensus opinion simply ridiculed the investigators of any New World finds. Perhaps these startling finds would have attracted more attention and study had they been made by scientists rather than gold miners or had they been found in Europe and not California. The point is, researchers have never even peeked in the door of the Americas as this investigation threatens the very foundation of Old World human origins research.

Another problem confronting late 19th century human evolutionists was the incipient argument for the relative stability of the human form. From accumulating skeletal evidence it appeared as if the modern human skeleton extended far back in time, an apparent fact which led many workers to either abandon or modify their views on human evolution. One such apostate was Alfred Russell Wallace (1823-1913). In 1887, Wallace examined the evidence for early man in the New World, and like the German anatomist Julian Kollman (1834-1918), who three years earlier had made a similar survey, found not only considerable evidence of antiquity for the available specimens, but also a continuity of type through time. In an effort to explain this, Wallace [1889, pp 454-461] suggested that once man had become morphologically differentiated from his apish kin (during the mid-Tertiary period), he had remained physically stable.²⁸

That these early appraisals have not been re-investigated is a statement of the times, as they were and remain today, as simple convictions of the past are often difficult to challenge. Surprisingly, these earliest of human remains were found to be contrary to the archaeological contexts emanating from the European fossil record while traditional anthropological opinions continue to discount any need for evaluating notions fundamentally opposed to traditional anthropology and human evolutionary law. Any suggestion of great antiquity for mankind within the Americas has ultimately brought with it the wrath of conservative opinions and the potential loss for further funding.²⁹

In spite of early 20th century claims purporting an early presence of American Indians, it was not until 1927 that the finding near Folsom, New Mexico, of fluted points imbedded in the ribcage of a giant bison that man was placed in immediate post-Wisconsin times (11,000 to 11,500 y.b.p.). That many amateur and professional anthropologists chose to argue for greater antiquity before this discovery (and were correct in their conceptual interpretations) remains of little value to their tarnished reputations. A similar conservative consensus has driven many scientists today into skeptical rejection of the potential anthropological significance surrounding acceptance or validation of "Pre-Clovis" archaeological contexts. This conservatism remains a larger than anticipated obstacle in my aim for scientific reappraisal. It is too late for this book to present a challenge to those reluctant *traditionalists* that were unwilling to share the appreciation of early "early man" finds made over 100 years ago. Today's researchers might find these sites are of little value as they pose little challenge to the opinions defining conventional wisdom. Science is not a democratic endeavor and the majority

²⁸ Spencer, F., "The Neandertals and Their Evolutionary Significance: A Brief Historical Survey," in Smith/Spencer, eds., op. cit. 1984 p. 13.

²⁹ If we do not focus on finding new specimens or date the human remains from the New World examined in the 18th century by Wallace, Kollman, Keith, and Ameghino then we are not observing the scientific obligation to search for human remains 'where no one has searched before.' Pre-Clovis depths; this is where the *real* funding for archaeological surveys in the Americas ends. Ameghino op. cit., 1935; Casas, op. cit.; Lummis, Charles F., *Mesa Canon and Pueblo*. The Century Co., New York and London 1925., (Charles Lummis was the founder of the Southwest Museum of Archeology).

opinion is just that, an opinion. In light of this fact, the preliminary foresight that draws an Old World source for *Homo sapiens* is itself divided by the path taken in becoming fully modern humans. The recognition of a worldwide Amerindian heritage holds us to a common ancestry that would identify our humanness as an enduring state, not one found in the hands or bosom of Old World non-sapient *Homo erectus* pre-genitors.

The Impasse and the Path Not Taken

“Paleoindian Traditions” and equivalent fluted points represent the earliest evidence of a stone-age hunting culture in the Americas deriving their name from the first discovery of these unique tools near Clovis New Mexico in 1907.³⁰ The discovery of Clovis Points (and other distinctive fluted-Traditions led archaeologists to establish a new time-limit for the first appearance of humans in the Americas, this being the end of the last Ice Age 11,200 years ago. Hrdlicka, in keeping with his “stick-in-the-mud” attitude, delayed the acceptance of “propertyed finds of an Ice Age settlement” by requiring his own men to be present at such a discovery. It was another discovery of Paleoindian tools in 1926, near Folsom New Mexico, that reset the stage for the first human occupation of the Americas. This new entrance date coincided with the end of the last Ice Age 11,500 ago (when Eurasians first returned to the Americas). This new limit remained the consensus until 1997 when a new unanimity conceded that the “pre-Clovis” barrier had been broken in Chile with the discovery of people living at “Monte Verde” 13,800 years ago. This site, preserved beneath a bed of peat and C-14 dating to 13,800 ybp (years before the present) has become the most important archaeological discovery in the Americas. This site became widely accepted in 1997 following a 20 year debate (and a 70 member team effort led by Tom Dillehay of the University of Kentucky) to prove its validity. reluctance to believe that humans entered the Americas no earlier than 1,000 BC Hrdlicka’s attitude is mirrored in the reluctance advocates of the Clovis-first theory have in now having to digest the erudite implications of pre-Clovis occupation of the Americas.

There is not a conspiracy in accepting that stone tool based “hunting Cultures” began in the Americas with the advent of Paleoindian Traditions less than 11,500 years ago. The evidence simply dictates that before this time people in the Americas did not leave behind the vivid proof quite like that which sustains the lithic corroboration left by “Paleoindians”. Simply, there are few highly modified stone stools from Monte Verde and none that are fluted or directly related to those found in North America’s Paleoindian Traditions. Equally important is the determination that *highly modified* stone tools, often the best or only preserved artifacts substantiating a human presence, are missing in other pre-Clovis sites. This phenomenon will be explained later (as well as the diffusion of Paleolithic know-how into pre-Clovis America), as well it should. There are two distinct terms and time-frames associated with archaeological phases encompassing Aboriginal inhabitation of the Americas:

“Paleoindian Traditions” post-dates the last Ice Age 11,200 y.b.p.

³⁰ The discovery belongs to George McJunkin, a scientist cowboy working on the Crowfoot Ranch.

Paleoindians occupation exhibit evidence of Blade-tools and elicit links with Old World Paleolithic Industries providing the first indications of specialized hunting cultures found in the Americas.

“Pre-Clovis” culture pre-dates the Last Ice Age and are affiliated with less robust archaeological definitions, missing any semblance’s easily diagnosed by later, truly unequivocal evidence accompanying Paleoindian Traditions. These occupations imply a learned economy, that is, a subsistence behavior relying on foraging and gathering.

In retrospect, the agreement that people were in the Americas at the end of the last Ice Age became the consensus following the verified archaeological discovery of Paleoindians and the fluted Paleolithic tools Traditions in 1927. The wide distribution of Cultures employing “Paleoindian Traditions” chronicled a devoted consensus depicting these hunters as the First Americans. The “Clovis-First” model was replaced in 1997, when a team of these advocates visited Monte Verde for the first time. As a result of this visit more and more advocates of the Paleoindian or Clovis-first theory accepted that: Chile’s Monte Verde site indeed a viable “pre-Clovis” occupation placing man in the Americas before the end of the last Ice Age. This new consensus not only affirms an earlier occupation of the Americas (then Paleoindian) but, dismisses the implications, paradigms, if you will, surrounding Paleoindian Cultures comprising the first Americans. Simply, the theory that the *first* Americans were accomplished hunters must now aqueous to the possibility that these behaviors spread into pre-existing Amerindian groups, since there were already pre-Clovis people in the Americas. This requires researchers to re-examine the behaviors associated with pre-Clovis people in order to determine how, when, or from where Paleoindian Traditions originated. Moreover, the science of archaeology must now fit into an emerging picture a new interpretation of Amerindian beginnings. Perhaps we might start with a disciplined investigation into why it took so long to accept evidence of “learned economies” and why pre-Clovis sites are so difficult for Clovis-First advocates to fathom!

Looking back to the Emergence of Clovis-First Theory

In the wake of the archaeological finds associated with the first discovery of “fluted Clovis projectile points” and/or “Paleoindian Traditions” a new consensus was born. That is, it was proposed that the ‘initial’ arrival of people into the Americas must have been linked with the arrival of people equipped with Upper Paleolithic (Solutrean) technologies. Moreover, the initial presence of fluted Clovis Points and Paleoindian Traditions coincides with the extinction of over 35 genera of mammals, extinction’s that occurred suddenly between 11,500 and 9,000 years ago. This extinction coincided with dates associated with other (though often unreported) discoveries of Paleoindian activities made between 1907 and 1926. The timing of these events establish the consensus’s opinion, one of an Terminal Ice Age arrival of Paleolithic hunting technologies and with them, the first Americans. The “scientific given” that the First Americans entered the New World for the first time by crossing the Bering Land Bridge at the end of the Ice Age, became entrenched in the consensus of “Clovis-First.” This consensus lasted for 70 years. Yet, to this day, archaeologists are unable to find the precursors of “fluted points” in northeast Asia. The timing of this proposed “first arrival” changed in 1997 with the

acceptance of people at Monte Verde, Chile in “pre-Clovis” times. What did not change, however, is the paradigm suggesting an Asian origin for Native Americans.

When first discovered and professionally analyzed (1927) the age in which the Clovis people lived pushed back Hrdlicka’s limits (for the first human arrival) nearly four fold, from 1,000 B.C. to 11,500 years ago. (For the record, dates for the oldest Paleoindian Traditions coincided with the end of the last Ice Age ~11,200 years ago.) Yet, in keeping with the conservative tone of scientific discourse surrounding human antiquity in the Americas, they too, were not accepted at the limits they defined for another ten years, until 1935. To fully appreciate the pace of science, it took twenty eight years from their initial discovery in 1907 to the time the true antiquity of Paleoindian Traditions became widely accepted.³¹ The following excerpts from *Natural History Magazine* (1997) present a timely explanation of the events that led to the acceptance of an Ice Age settlement of the Americas. Notice that my impression of Hrdlicka is mirrored here by Douglas Preston.³²

“Fossils & the Folsom Cowboy”

“In September 1908, a cowboy named George McJunkin, foreman of the Crowfoot Ranch in eastern New Mexico, encountered a fencing problem... While pondering how to fix the fence, McJunkin noticed some freshly exposed bones at the bottom of the trench. He climbed down into the arroyo and, using his pliers, dug out a couple of bones, which he tied behind his saddle and brought back to the ranch house.

Some four months after McJunkin’s death [January 1922] Carl Schwachheim and Fred Howarth decided to visit the McJunkin bone pit. ...

In January 1926, Howarth had to deliver some cattle to a stockyard in Denver. He hired Schwachheim to look after the cattle on the train trip, and in Denver the two men carried the [newly discovered] sack of bones over to the Colorado Museum of Natural History (now the Denver Museum of Natural History). They were ushered into the office of Jesse D. Figgins, the museum’s director, and *unwittingly stepped into the center of one of the most controversial scientific questions of the day: the antiquity of human beings in the New World* (p.18). (*emphasis added*)

At the time, Ales Hrdlicka, curator of the Smithsonian’s Division of Physical Anthropology, dominated the field of anthropology. In the nineteenth century, many unsupported claims had been advanced “proving” the Indians had been in the New World for tens *and even hundreds of thousands of years*. But by Hrdlicka’s time, a powerful reaction against such claims had developed. Hrdlicka became the leader of the skeptics, undertaking a crusade to debunk what he considered bad science. His view, based on skull morphology, was that Indians had arrived in the New World no earlier than 1,000 B.C. When any unfortunate archeologist made an assertion to the contrary, Hrdlicka reacted so vigorously that he sometimes ruined the career of his target. By 1925, the atmosphere was such that most archeologists were too intimidated to make a report. *The subject of early humans in America was effectively taboo* (p. 18). (*emphasis added*)

McJunkin’s bone pit was one of the most important archeological discoveries made in America, and *it caused a permanent shift in the prevailing paradigm*. All of a sudden, archeologists had another 7,000 years of human history to account for. The find also made the search for early Americans respectable again, and it provided a time span that was sufficient to explain the bewildering diversity of languages and customs of Native American tribes.

³¹ by George McJunkin, a now renowned cowboy scientist of the American southwest,

³² *Natural History Magazine* 2/97. Fossils & the Folsom Cowboy, by Douglas Preston, pp. 16-22

Once such a shift occurs, a flood of new discoveries and a reevaluation of older ones often follow. In the two decades after the Folsom find, dozens of Paleo-Indian sites came to light, and papers came pouring out of museums and universities across the country. *The fluted Folsom points had been turning up for years-only nobody had recognized them for what they were.* The Folsom find led directly to the discovery of an even older culture, the Clovis mammoth hunters, who were the immediate ancestors of the Folsom people. Hrdlicka found himself increasingly isolated, and yet the grumpy old warlord of physical anthropology would not admit his error. When the association of human artifacts with Pleistocene mammoths, horses, camels, and bison could no longer be denied Hrdlicka suggested that these animals had become extinct far more recently than was supposed. Like the Swiss zoologist and geologist Louis Agassiz, who went to his deathbed denying Darwin's theory of evolution, Hrdlicka never accepted the antiquity of human beings in the New World (20-21). *(emphasis added)*

Half a century after his death, McJunkin was still held in high regard by the citizens of Folsom, who, while knowing little about the scientific revolution he had caused, remembered with great affection the remarkable black cowboy with the telescope, bones, and scientific books (p 21., Preston 1997)."

From the discovery of Paleoindian People some 90 years ago the initial "settlement of the Americas" has remained largely unchallenged with Clovis hunters being the New Worlds first human inhabitants. This, terminal Ice Age arrival for man into the Americas, has been in vogue since 1935 while, as Preston points out, its own acceptance was debated for nearly a decade.

Mirroring the difficulty Clovis proponents had in establishing a terminal Ice Age presence are the researchers of Monte Verde (some seventy fold), led by Tom Dillehay of the University of Kentucky. The acceptance of even earlier inhabitants than the Clovis mammoth hunters has been gaining steam over the past century and, as the train finally arrives at the station - a little late and a little worn from the journey - archaeologists with other pre-Clovis sites are certainly ready to rejoice in the shadows of the pristine evidence substantiating Monte Verde. Simply, Monte Verde can not be the only site of its kind, nor will it be the oldest. It most certainly will be remembered as the first to gain widespread acceptance, and perhaps the best preserved enabling its researchers to shift the minds of the Clovis First camp and bring the phenomenon of "pre-Clovis" to a consensus. The first quarter of the century and the reputations that were won and lost then have no less of a parallel in today's advocacy of "mid-Pleistocene" (pre-Clovis) Amerindian occupations, sites 30,000 years old and older. Certainly a shifting of the paradigm from Clovis First to pre-Clovis occupation has been accomplished although there still remains skeptics of a pre Ice Age human settlement of the Americas. Dillehay and his team may have won the battle of attrition while the growing acceptance of Monte Verde only promises to redirect the efforts others have championed in establishing a mid-Pleistocene occupation of the Americas.

Before the Emergence of Paleoindian Traditions

Before the end of the Last Ice Age pre-Clovis People must have coexisted with mammoths, mastodons, giant ground sloth, saber tooth cats, dire wolves, and other now extinct genera, without "stone age hunting" technologies later possibly used to hunt them into extinction. I believe that the underlying problem in understanding pre-Clovis archaeology is not that there weren't people in the Americas before the end of the last Ice Age ~12,000 years ago, but that the earliest Amerindians did not employ, and thus, leave

evidence of, elaborate stone tools for hunting. Simply, archaeologists looking for human habitations before the end of the last Ice Age are confounded by Paleolithic evidence that is conspicuously missing. The lack of evidence of *refined* stone tools within the pre-Clovis archaeological record is so contrary to what should be expected that most archaeologists find unacceptable lesser evidence that might be found as proof of human habitation. The end result can be likened to a mythological “Trickster” revising for archaeologists the discernible evidence that traditionally is accompanied by stone artifacts. This evidence should not be the issue simply because the early “early man” record seems diminished. It may demonstrate rather, that *before* the dawn of Paleoindian Cultures, people in the Americas were living in isolation, unaware of stone-age technologies developed within the confines of the Old World.

It was the Old World descendants of earlier Amerindian populations who developed a new (the Old World Upper Paleolithic developed between 45,000 and 12,000) highly refined stone tool industry, even more highly refined than those used by *Homo erectus*. As shown in the examples (**figure 2**) the Later Stone Age of Africa, the Upper Paleolithic of Europe, and the Late Paleolithic of Asia, (contemporary terms for modern human activities dating to less than 45,000 years ago). All represent stone age technologies offering archaeologists lasting evidence of Paleolithic Industries in the Eastern Hemisphere. This perspective is not based on scientific bias of some sort but on understanding stages of mankind’s behavioral evolution detailing highly skilled stone industries earlier in the Old World. But why does this kind of evidence occur in the Old World 40,000 years ago and not in the New World until 11,500 years ago? Does this impart a new course of action of mankind’s behavioral evolution, one reconstructed from the lifeways of pre-Clovis people?

The answer is directly related to cause and effect, the key factors empowering behavioral evolution. Simply, as mankind explores he becomes more refined in how he interacts with his environment. The introduction, from Northeast Asia (or Europe), of specialized hunting tools into pre-existing Native America societies, accompanied, coincidentally, the melting of the last Ice Age 12,000 years ago. The removal of the Ice Age barrier separating the two hemisphere may have led Native Americans to adopt, as evidenced, of-and-by diffusion, large game hunting by incorporating specialized stone tool industries into earlier pre-Clovis lifeways. The term used to explain such a behavioral revolution is “diffusion”. Demic-diffusion from Europe explains the sudden appearance of Paleolithic Industries, technologies that were refined (by fluting the stem of these long points) into “Paleoindian Traditions.”³³ While northeast Asia has long remained the only identified corridor for migration a direct route from Europe cannot be ruled out. In fact, I am beginning to believe that this route alongside the southern Glacial coastal boundaries of the Atlantic better explains why the first or oldest evidence of Paleoindian Traditions is found in the eastern Atlantic states.

It is clear that pre-Clovis subsistence strategies, lacking as they do a modified stone tool hunter/gatherer correlation, are far removed from what archaeologists had long come to expect. This is due, in part, to expectations used to conform with the “philosophical given of an Asian origin” for the first Americans. The missing link between pre-Clovis and Clovis is the evidence that supports diffusion of stone tool traditions into isolated, but ancestral, human populations. The inability to explain or even

³³ not Northeast Asia

accept the ramifications of this scenario has undermined a theory to accompany the observation of pre-Clovis habitation. The assimilation of Middle Paleolithic Industries by the first Old World Amerindians resulted from the first contact with *Homo erectus* by *Homo sapiens* beyond the backdoor of the Americas 45,000 years ago. The incorporation of a highly refined Paleolithic earlier in the Old World explains precisely why it took so long to accept pre-Clovis habitation of the Americas. The detailed evidence of human activities at Monte Verde, preserved beneath a layer of peat, overshadows the Clovis-First theory confirming that there were people in the Americas before 12,000 years ago. Perhaps another background article would help explain the difficulty skeptics have overcome in now accepting an earlier than Clovis presence in the Americas.

Archaeology Magazine, pp. 60-63, March/April 1997, Book Review by Brian M. Fagan: *Monte Verde: A Late Pleistocene Settlement in Chile*, by Tom Dillehay, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997.

“For more than a century archaeologists have battled over when the Americas were first settled. The debate has been remarkable for its passion, rancor, and lack of hard archaeological data. Perhaps this is because conferences are easier to organize than excavations, but the fact remain that only a handful of archaeological sites document early occupation. Few are thoroughly published. Monte Verde is an exception.

Monte Verde is an open-air wetland residential site with bone and wooden artifacts, hut foundations, and ecological evidence preserved under a peat layer dating to about 13,000 years ago (p. 60).” ...

“The carbon dates place the main cultural component between 12,300 and 12,800 years ago. A much earlier layer, opened up on a limited basis and possibly of cultural origin, dates to between 32,840 and 33,900 b.p. (p. 61).” ...

“Later chapters [in Dillehay 1997] study cordage and used ground surfaces, present-day and ancient plants, and stone tools. The latter include four simple bifaces, perforators and bola stones, and many expediently used stone fragments such as convenient, sharp-edged flakes picked up and used for such tasks as cutting hide or scraping wood. The closest analogies come from the Taima Taima site in distant Venezuela. Wisely, Dillehay does not pursue the general similarities closely. The Monte Verde team made microwear observations on 242 stone tool, finding evidence for processing of materials such as plants and softwoods. An exhaustive study of the animal remains, down to cut marks on individual fragments, identified six or seven mastodon, and paleo-lama, amphibians, reptiles, and birds, even bird eggshell. Animal tissue samples include shreds of hide associated with dwellings and pieces of mastodon flesh. Two concluding chapters summarize evidence for seasonal occupation, social organization, and economic diversification necessitated by spreading temperate forest (pp. 61-62).” ...

“In the epilogue, Dillehay stresses the diversity of early human settlement in the New World. Monte Verde paints a *very different picture of first settlement from northern Paleoindian kill sites*. . . The Monte Verdeans used a great variety of resources within three miles of their settlement. *They combined foraging with specialized plant collecting*. Interestingly, studies of different houses revealed variations in the use of local and non-local materials, as if the Monte Verdeans were exploring new and little-known habitats within their circumscribed territory. Dillehay believes the people *used a simple technology to gather and experiment with diverse food resources. They exploited a large territory yet used minimal technology to do so*. Perhaps they had what Dillehay calls a “learning economy,” with contacts with other groups living at some distance.

Alternatively, they may have practiced a strategy common in later times—the exploitation of different ecological zones to reduce risk should the resources of any one zone fail (p. 62). (*emphasis added*)” ...

“Monte Verde was so unexpected that some archaeologists, this reviewer among them wondered if the site really was an undisturbed cultural layer. *We were wrong, Dillehay has proved Monte Verde is a settlement*, probably at the threshold of colonization of the Americas. He has also shown that we must think of the initial settlement of the New World not as a set of simple migrations, but as a process of complex and diverse adaptation to a myriad of unfamiliar environments. Monte Verde, a humble yet complex settlement, reveals the first Americans for what they really were: small, highly diverse human groups capable of adapting to almost any environment (p. 62). (*emphasis added*)” ...

“Dillehay and his colleagues---some 70 scientists from many academic disciplines and different nations--- have been at pains to put any doubts about the authenticity of the site. This is how it should be, given the very early date of Monte Verde and its enormous importance to our knowledge of the first settlement of the Americas.

The Monte Verde monograph does far more than record and authenticate an archaeological site of international significance. Dillehay and his colleagues have set the standards to be expected when documenting a site which purports to chronicle early settlement (p. 63)” ...

“He has done brilliantly with Monte Verde, and this volume is a remarkable testimony to a fine archaeologist and to what modern archaeological teamwork can achieve. *Would that others would follow Dillehay’s example* (p. 63). (*all emphasis added*)”³⁴

MONTE VERDE: Scourge of the “Clovis First” Theory

What Monte Verde provides is; a verified site to now compare other less well preserved potential habitations with. Certainly, everyone searching for pre-Clovis habitations should have an archaeological site set beneath peat! The acceptance of Monte Verde as a late Pleistocene site must be attributed to not only the painstaking energy of the discoverer, but, to the viability of the archaeological signature left behind (preserved below a layer of peat) by the inhabitants nearly 13,000 years ago. Here the Trickster has revealed what we should (or should not) be looking for in pre-Clovis times! Fagan suggests that discriminating archaeologists would believe that other - early New World - sites would have been substantiated earlier if researchers were as thorough as Dillehay’s team. That it has taken over 20 years - from the initial discovery in 1976 - for archaeologists to finally accept Monte Verde as a late Pleistocene human settlement does not surprise other archaeologists with “pre-Clovis” discoveries - not preserved in peat. What the Trickster is waiting for us to learn from this lesson is that we must apply

³⁴ “Would that others would follow Dillehay’s example.” “Wisely, Dillehay does not pursue the general similarities closely.” Both of these statements epitomize the same “rancor” Fagan has himself criticized. Perhaps a “TRUCE” should be called while the digging for answers should be into the mind of scientific objectivity.

untested theories to these distinct New World definitions. Could these activities be signs of a more ancient human behavior, predating Old World advancements made during the Upper Paleolithic? This holds true in evaluating, as Fagan asserts, the “international significance” modeling pre-Clovis occupation of the Americas warrants.

As for the activities associated with Monte Verde, could they represent a specialized form of subsistence economy born from generations of occupation of the Americas? The evidence shows little, if any, of the signatures suggesting contact with Old World hunter/gatherers, in direct conflict with the now disproved “Clovis First” theory. A new theory must emerge from the “rancor” of the past century by developing a paradigm to test the relationships that now do not link the first Americans as descendants of Old World Paleolithic hunters. The subsistence behavior defining Monte Verde’s “learning economy” may represent the ancestral condition the human primate was born into (humans are primates while primates are not human). The untested hypothesis - offering an autochthonous (in-situ) isolation for the human species within the confines of the Americas - is compatible with Monte Verde’s Pleistocene definition as a definition supporting an ancient lifeway. The “replacement” of Old World hominids by modern humans from the Americas requires that we interpret the significance of a Pleistocene or Ice Age Amerindian presence. As Fagan asserts, the archaeological signatures from Monte Verde requires we deliberate their “international significance.” They also should allow Americanists a comparison for validating what are “simple technologies” being employed by “highly diverse human groups capable of adapting to almost any environment (p. 62).”

Monte Verde promises to offer to New World archaeologists what Jackie Robinson did for African-American athletes and baseball. It will grow beyond these first steps - removing discrimination on the playing field - and provide a new measure for the verification of what we should and should not expect in accepting New World Pleistocene sites. The significance of Monte Verde may never be repeated. The magnitude it’s acceptance holds, by debunking “consensus opinion”, has brought mid-Pleistocene human occupation of the Americas to another level, one explored in this book. The treasure chest of scientific information Dillehay and his team have uncovered may substantiate the early ecological balance humankind once held in the primordial niche in the America’s. Perhaps Monte Verdeans were no more new to their environment then was the Americas they inhabited a new World.

CHAPTER VI. NATIVE AMERICAN CONCEPTS

Autochthonous Origins

“*When-Man-First-Was*” offers a new approach to acquiring the Great Mystery of our lost past. It aims to challenge the tenants of what is *given* by rekindling the fire of a paradigm lost from the turn-of-the-preceding-Century. Defining alternatives to philosophical givens is difficult, especially when paddling against the flow generated by an academic consensus. Returning to untested alternatives in science, can be likened to re-tracing one’s steps, commemorating the journey that took us into a *new* Old World. New light can be shed from the journey that has taken us to the present impasse presently engulfing human origins research. It is time to apply the lessons gained in looking only to the

Eastern Hemisphere by hypothesizing an American Wellspring for our recent colonization of it. Does this old idea have any potential to lead us to our desired destination, a “final answer” to how long we have been fully human? This un-tested fork in the trail represents not just an exploration into new territory but a more direct route to the appointed destination, the Holy Grail of evolutionary anthropology; human origins. This hypothesis does not represent an abandonment of what we have learned from the past but a re-examination of the signposts that have led us astray. The past was once understood by those who were there watching the Sun as it set on distant horizons in both time and place. Ancient people offered clues to reveal what we are trying to rekindle today. They knew back when where they came from for this was but recent history to them. It is the lost pages of our human past’s history that anthropologists aim to recover. With this in mind we will examine the lost frontiers and the lesson from the journey that holds true, the pre-History of Earth’s first human explorers (*Homo sapiens*).

We shall see that in anthropology, as in other scientific disciplines and circles, predetermined philosophical givens can lead to erroneous conclusions. Alternatives, that at first appear unwarranted, are occasionally dismissed before being adequately investigated. Eventually, what might appear to be a novel idea will find a forerunner in the works of others who (because they were in the minority), may have entertained a similar model that too ran contrary to the accepted “archetype”. The nature of discovery is bound by the interpretation that a great mystery has yet to be revealed. When great mysteries remain unresolved, especially after more than a century of research, it is sometimes best to return to the root of the issue and reexamine alternatives that were not optimistically entertained by the reigning majority.

Those who are near to the core may understand great Mysteries. For example, the Indigenous American Indians were aware of the vastness of the “Americas” long before the exploration’s of Lewis and Clark. Alternatively, scientists, reluctant to probe indigenous knowledge for their origins have long relied on evidence gained through extrinsic methods. Today we are challenged in accepting the spiritual foundations of these people and their efforts to re-bury their past dug up during the past five centuries. When we participate in their ceremonies we find that they represent not only knowledge of the Great Mystery but, a way of conducting life. Yet, the Original Stories and the instructions that have been passed down by ceremony have been, for the most part, hidden from us by our own affectation. But who is to blame and what good does that do us? We are looking for solutions, how to find them and what to do with them when we do. The history of anthropology itself may someday come to reveal that the answers this science yearns to recover were long ago excluded from the debate.

To understand relationships including the evolution of what came first, where, why, and how it came-to-be today, scientists must take into consideration the consequences of starting with “philosophical givens.” If an initial hypothesis used to guide our observations is wrong the end product will leave many unanswered questions. By identifying that the first people to enter the Americas were Asians we have automatically eliminated the American Indian and the Western Hemisphere as a source for Old World human ancestors. If the answer to Native American origins is not an Asian origin, then what we are left with in continuing to force this believe are indiscernible pieces of a puzzle and a box (picture) with the wrong cover (description) to go by. More often than not, when new explanations are explored many of the observations we are

building from become clear. It is obvious that there remains a continuing enigma regarding scientific verification of *modern* human origins. The uncertainty of how our species came to find ourselves in the Old World just 45,000 years ago could redirect itself to the equation that was first removed before we began this scientific investigation. Could the earliest Homo *sapiens* of the Old World have been Native Americans migrating out of the Western Hemisphere?

The main contention contained in the passages of this book is drawn in the form of a hypothesis. It centers on the origins of not only the first Americans, but also, Homo *sapiens* and their recent (nearly 40,000 year) migrations throughout the Old World. The difficulty scientists once had in accepting that the Mound Builders were in fact the ancestors of Indian tribes living today underscores the predetermined attitude that early anthropologists only confounded by dismissing Native Americans from human origin research. This book will address, for the first time since the turn-of-the-Century, the likelihood that the Indigenous Americans are truly indigenous. It will contrast an American wellspring with the rationalization that the sudden emergence of Homo *sapiens* must be linked with a separate species, isolated and yes, unrelated to Homo *erectus*.

There are two contrasting models of human evolution emanating from the Old World:

- I. “Multiregional Evolution”, where individual continental populations of Homo *erectus* somehow independently evolve into Homo *sapiens*.
- II. The “Eve Hypothesis” acquiescent to “Sudden Replacement” with Homo *sapiens* having a single recent place of origin, depicting a second, more recent, migration out of Africa or Asia.

Unfortunately, the proponents of the “Sudden Replacement” theory will have nothing to do with the idea that the Americas could be the wellspring for this “replacement.” Simply, researchers seeking a single location for the origin the first Homo *sapiens* of Europe, the Cro-Magnon People, and as well, the first modern Africans, Asians, and Australians, have yet to turn the stones of the Americas over to contemplate that this was the original “Turtle Island”.³⁵

If the trickster is revealed all things will fall into place. My quest is to integrate ancient voices of the myth-giver with lost passages from academia’s past and, with this, to create an expanded dialogue incorporating Native Peoples views with abstract theory. In the performance of re-introducing these ideas into today’s debate I have been met by everything from skeptical openness to hidden ridicule. Eموke Szathmary, Editor and Chief of the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, likens me to “a civilian” surrounded by a world of professional intellectuals while I have come to see my place in this discussion as both gratifying and cumbersome. Even-so, taking the road less traveled has enabled me to study the whole bug, if you will, and not just the tip of the left antenna. Moreover, my independent investigation enables me to create my own bias, by not inheriting academia’s. The end product promises to offer you, the reader, new insights into mankind’s remarkable journeys that have taken us to every *corner* of the *globe* (despite the fact the world isn’t flat). In retracing these accomplishments a fresh place to start in the search for our human beginnings can be secured.

³⁵ The turtle is considered in many origin stories as the resting place from which the land masses are believed to have arisen from the waters.

In 1986 Ken Littlefish, a Native American of Ojibwian/Anishinaabe descent, and his family came to the mountain homestead needing a place for their sweat lodge. From there he began to counsel me on how the ‘origin’ of human beings came-to-be; knowledge he and other Indigenous Americans had from their own stories of the past. Grounded in these “interpretations” is the belief that inter-relationships exist between all entities and this connection is held together by the universal laws defining “Seven Directions.” Many indigenous belief systems embrace a universal Passage that link all life to one-another all sharing the physical plane of four directions. Where the earth meets the sky the past, the present, and the future merge as one, everything is related in time. The Earth is seen as our mother, where the womb of joyous life is conceived. Our Sun, radiant beacon of the cosmos, illuminates the spirit conceived within the Earth mother, nourishing her seeds into sum and substance. The indigenous mind sees all life as individual participants in Creation. Evolution mirrors the temperance of time on all beings, we but exemplar of the procession of life found throughout the universe. Human beings and all Earth’s relations are the blessed beneficiaries of a bountiful world that holds its own domain in balance with the orientation of a benevolent Sun. This book will consider the basic tenants of native teachings, acquiescing to the spirit and power of the Great Mysteryⁱⁱ to reveal untold wonders. This process will, when combined in accordance with a reverence for the omnipotence of scientific inquiry, ask new questions in the quest for absolute truth connected with the wellspring of humanity.

The scientific quest to reveal great mysteries in anthropology has its own lessons to take from the journey it explores. The ancestors of the Anishinaabe also entered into the forest of darkness from the original sanctity of the grasslands and through trial and error were able to learn how to sustain themselves. Understanding how to make the crooked road strait by unmasking lessons held by the trickster is how great mysteries are revealed. For the past 140 years, the Trickster has held the anthropologist at his mercy waiting for them to return half starved, trusting to nourish the human spirit once again by revealing great mysteries of the past. In any search is held the lesson and, from this, what is made of it. Pre-history is more than what has passed before us. Pre-history is the ways and means (the culminating record of our transcended DNA), that has brought us to where we are today.

Ceremonies bring definition to the past, rekindled in the sacredness of the fire. Ceremonial fires illuminate the mind to reveal great mysteries when, in time, it is best that we should know. In this way we seek to fully understand the how and why of great truths, building knowledge from the journey itself. Thus, when obstacles bar the path we believed least resistant, we remember the lessons gained and, if need be, willingly return to the source of our first departure. When we empty the mind of bias we are better prepared to adopt the alternative route not taken. To continue to misplace the lessons by misinterpreting the past however, is to play with fire. For this reason anthropologists should be mindful of the signposts it has discovered along the way. If we are unwilling to accept them, we will continue to starve the mind of alternatives, detouring from our original goal in the process.

If we start with an assumption, and it is wrong, we will find chaos in what is revealed of any great mystery. Conflict should lead us to question our most basic assumptions while evidence of chaos should help guide us in accepting limitations garnered along the way. It is in science that we aim to understand natural order. Yet,

predisposed knowledge can be a treacherous servant, if it is flawed. Running amuck with an assumption that is wrong only leads to a better appreciation of chaos. The existence of chaos may very well indicate that we are being led astray. Simply, the more complicated something is to explain the better chance that natural order has been misconstrued.

The scientific quest to unmask our past is the fire that burns in every anthropologist. Conceding this fire to burn unfinished, by devising ambiguous explanations for evidence that has, in its foundation, “missing links”, is to diminish the sacredness of mans relationship to the past and the reason we search to comprehend it. From the first time that mankind picked up fire (AH-WHOM), to warm the spirit that dwells within, he chose to abide in the sacredness of this kinship. The lesson at hand, the one that transcends the efforts of anthropologists today, is to make sense of our past, to digest the observations we have placed before us, to warm our-selves by the fire. By properly interpreting clues left by the trickster, solutions can be anticipated. The lessons from our past and our connection with them are fundamental elements of the “Forth World”, stepping stones into the future. In the hands of man Fire is both a tool and a sacred element, as is accurate knowledge of the past a tool, and, when held in ceremonial circles traditionally reflecting “a way of life”, instructions for future generations.

Cheyenne Renewal

Our relationship to the elements that surround us are tied to universal laws, to a natural order and we may find expressions of these instructions in the principal understanding that all of Earth’s life forms are related. The Cheyenne Renewal Ceremony honors the spirit of time when life is said to have descended upon this world bringing unanimity of the four basic elements - earth, air, water, and fire. There is no alter in the first day of this “Renewal Ceremony” for the Earth was at one time, a host, renewed only in the creation of life. Joyous Life was formed from the melding of these basic elements and thus began the creation of spiritual hosts, of which all living things hold eminence. Before this time, the earth was but a host, itself created from the cosmic dust of Star Nations lost. The Earth beckoned from its neighboring star ‘radiance’ and from the Earth’s womb was born the procession of life. From most elemental beings there came to be a place, each adapting to the world it was born to, evolving side-by-side as each day passed. The Cheyenne hold that creativity is contained in every living entity, each being a microcosm in the macrocosm, all being related. In the Renewal Ceremony the green Earth is brought to the surface by the Lizard Dancers who take their place in the East; while Swift-hawk Dancers, messengers from the South, bear witness of this Renewal of Life rejoicing Earthly creation into the Cosmos; where-upon this message finds it way to the Dream-Spirit and Star-Nation Dancers in the West who, in acknowledging the majesty of joyous life upon the Earth, both revel and rebel; challenged only by the mirrored omnipotence of the Eagle Nation Dancers in the North, the protectors of free will (agency). As one in the same, both “Great Mystery” and “Great Spirit”, do we dance in its image praying tribute to the Earth and “all its relations” as one with the Universe.

For many Native Americans the quest to understand earthly origins warrants nothing more than in accepting that we are part of this great mystery.³⁶ By this, when we seek to find an answer for an “unknown reality” we need only accept that, if it is important enough for us to know, it will be revealed in time. The world will still go on, enlightening us with lessons we gather along the way. My own quest is to set the record strait, since, as I see it, (and please excuse the feelings of certitude) anthropology is caught up in its own creative web, struggling to untangle its own revelations.³⁷ Certainly, know-one should be held responsible as the trickster³⁸ has had millions of years to mask our evolutionary past. By example, scientists have their own lessons of “trial and error”, knowing that it is sometimes best to start over anew, emptying the mind of assumptions that can lead us astray. When we adopt alternatives we begin renewed. By illuminating any bias inherent in our assumptions we empower the world of the great mystery to reveal itself. In doing so we master what we know by accepting what we don’t know. With this in mind, we can provision from the trickster free-flowing clues and from them lessons from our own studies of the past. When “chaos” is illuminated so to will be the mysteries of our past.

Four Directions

The Chumash discipline finds that before there was life (conception), there was our world, “Hutash”, the “Womb of Creation” and “S’Lo”, the Star who fell in-love with her radiance. Following the marriage between - Hutash and S’Lo -, joyous life began to take physical form eventually reaching the boundaries of this second awareness cycle and into the world of higher life forms. The third door into our past brought an awareness favoring a level of maturity where “all our relations” were seen to work in harmony, as in an evolved state, the third world; Gia’s last billion years. This process evolves into the Forth World and the present, where today’s “great mysteries” of the future resides.

Their have been many refinements (evolutionary strides) in the life of this planet. In geologic terms the process leading to the ascension of new life forms is often punctuated, (brought about by cataclysmic events including clashes with meteorites, an intervening Ice Age, or other process), affording environmental consequences and a new niche’s development. Yet, contrasting these episodes of punctuation; conformity reigns. From the dawn of the Proterozoic Era (2.5 billion to 550 million years ago), to the Paleozoic Era (to 245 million), the Mesozoic Era (to 65 million), and into today’s Cenozoic Era (the age of higher mammals), higher life forms came to become what they are today.

Proterozoic Era	Paleozoic Era	Mesozoic Era	Cenozoic Era
earliest life	ancient life	middle life	recent life
cyanobacteria	plants/vertebrates	reptiles/early mammals	mammals

³⁶ The Great Mystery does not limit our ability to precieve that there is Universal truth. We need only accept that we are part of this dominion.

³⁷ The Great Mystery is in reality, bound by natural order. The Great Spirit enlightens our way to the truth.

³⁸ Tricksters represent supernatural beings in native mythology and are often able to reveal great mysteries to mortals by playing games with our minds. Gestalt, a unified whole, is revealed through the exploration of natural order. It is the spiritual state of the medicine man, shaman, and scientist that "great mysteries" are brought as knowledge to the people. The scientists works in this mannor but they to must alos be on the lookout for aberrations placed in the path of truth by tricksters creating bias.

3 billion to 550 million to 245 million to 65 million to the present

Table 1 Earth's Four Worlds: Geologic Epoch; Dominant Life; Duration

The evolution of the Earth spans four and a half billion years with living forms inhabiting Hutash (Earth) for all but perhaps the first 500 million. The Earth is, certainly, a very willing host. Individual life-forms within inherent ecosystems evolved through the countless generations, consummated in distinct adaptations, the form of each being left in messages that are contained in the rhythm and rhyme of every specie's DNA. We maintain, in the essence of our individual DNA, a primordial clock, a map of our path from the beginning of our conception to the sudden shifting of life's arrangement though "punctuation", and then, to a new "equilibrium", and re-shifting again, and back, Eras in time on the planet Earth, separate worlds retold by the myth-giver, held in tact by our DNA.

The Hopi of the American southwest share a description of the origins of Earth, and life upon it, compatible with the with Cheyenne Renewal Ceremony and, as we shall see, scientific evolutionary theory. Frank Waters' retells this procession from Four Worlds to the present in "*Book of the Hopi*" (1960).

Tokpela: The First World

The first world was Tokpela [Endless Space].

But first they say, there was only the Creator, Taiowa. All else was endless space. There was no beginning and no end, no time, no shape, no life. Just an immeasurable void that had it's beginning and end, time, shape, and life in the mind of Taiowa the Creator.

Then he, the infinite, conceived the finite. First he created Sotuknang to make it manifest, saying to him, "I have created you, the first power and instrument as a person, to carry out my plan for life in endless space. I am your Uncle. You are my Nephew. Go now and lay out these universes in proper order so they may work harmoniously with one another according my plan."

Sótuknang did as he was commanded. From endless space he gathered that which was to be manifest as solid substance, molded it into forms, and into nine universal kingdoms: one for Taiowa the Creator, one for himself, and seven universes for the life to come. Finishing this, Sótuknang went to Taiowa and asked, "Is this according to your plan?"

"It is very good," Taiowa, "Now I want you to do the same thing with the waters. Place them on the universes so that each would be half solid and half water. Going now to Taiowa, he said, "I want you to see the work I have done and if it pleases you."

"It is very good," said Taiowa. "The next thing now is to put the forces of air into peaceful movement about all."

This Sótuknang did. From endless space he gathered that which was to be manifest as the airs, made them into great forces, and arranged them into gentle ordered movements around each universe.

Taiowa was pleased. "You have done a great work according to my plan, Nephew. You have created the universes and made them manifest in solids, waters, and winds, and put them in their proper places. But your work is not yet finished. Now you must create life and it's movement to complete the four parts, Túwaquchi, of my universal plan.

SPIDER WOMAN AND THE TWINS

Sótuknang went to the universe wherein was that to be Tokpela, the First World, and out of it he created her who was to remain on that earth and be his helper. Her name was Kókyangwúti, Spider Woman.

When she awoke to life and received her name, she asked, "Why am I here?"

"Look about you," answered Sótuknang. "Here is this earth we have created. It has shape and substance, direction and time, a beginning and an end. But there is no life upon it. We see no joyful movement. We hear no joyful sound. What is life without sound and movement? So you have been given the power to help create this life. You have been given the knowledge, wisdom, and love to bless all the beings you create. That is why you are here (Waters, pgs. 3 and 4)."

THE NATURE OF MAN

With the pristine wisdom granted them they understood that the earth was a living entity like themselves. She was their mother; they were made from her flesh; they suckled at her breast. For her milk was the grass upon which all animals grazed and the corn which had been created specially to supply food for mankind (Waters, pg. 7)."

From the very beginning to today and beyond Hopi stories retell of the origins of the cosmos, the dawn of life on Earth and the migrations of mankind upon it. These "narratives" are in balance with scientific truths directing modern research today. Outlined here is the development of the Universe going back in time to the expansion of our cosmos, to the sun and its formation, then Earthly matter, and finally the dawn of life. This awareness is an accurate translation akin with interpretations from the Renewal Ceremony. Even more detailed knowledge is contained in legends of America's most recent past. Mankind's journey through the Four Worlds of the Hopi will be addressed as we proceed, for they articulate specific histories of the migrations of human beings, both out of, and back into, the Americas. Suffice-it-to-say, the Hopi identify the "Back Door to this, the forth world" as a fundamental element in interpreting the *New World's* role in pre-history.

It was during the forth world that man migrated out through the Back Door to populate the Old World.

When the previous parts of the world were put underneath the water, this new land was pushed up in the middle to become the backbone of the earth. You are now standing on the *átvila* [west slope]. But you have not yet made your migrations. You have not yet followed your stars where you will meet and settle. this you must do before I will become your [Masaw]³⁹ leader. But if you go back to evil ways again I will take over the earth from you, for I am it's caretaker, guardian, and protector. To the north you will find cold and ice. That is the Backdoor to this Land, and those that come through this Back Door will enter without my consent. So go now and claim the land with my permission."

When Másaw disappeared, the people divided into groups and clans to begin their migrations.

"May we meet again!" they all called back to one another.

This is how it all began on this, our forth world. As we know it, it's name is Túwaqachi, World complete, its direction north, its color *sikyangpu*, yellowish white. Chiefs upon it are the tree *kneumapee*, juniper; the bird *mongwau*, the owl. the animal *tohopko*, the mountain lion; and the mixed mineral *sikyapala*.

Where all the people went on their migrations to the ends of the earth and back, and what they have done to carry out the plan of Creation from this place of beginning to the present time, is to be told next by all the clans as they came in (Waters pg. 22).

As foretold in Hopi prophecy the consequential abandonment of the original instructions would doom the migration of man beyond the backdoor to the Americas. It

³⁹ caretaker of the Forth World

was in forsaking the original instructions, shared by the creator with all human beings before the migrations into the Forth World, that misconceptions of a common origin would be brought to the Americas. It is opulent greed and accompanying ambivalence to an-other's past that has led many to ignore the original instructions that are shared by all of humanity. Interpreting this lesson from our past is tantamount to regaining instructions lost from the journey. The Hopi remember this warning, as do tribal people be they those who left through the "Back Door" or those who remained behind. Anthropologists, believing they are in charge of interpreting the past, must now address this message as we move into the Fifth World of the Hopi. Taboos are often of our own making and I liken them as examples for scientists themselves, who study other's taboos. If the shoe fits wear it" applies for when unwelcome axioms are ignored, left lifeless are the solutions they advance. Cinderella must be invited to the Ball or the Kingdom will never know of her beauty. The story of the Native Americans past may be more than just their own, it may span every-one's journey as one that transcend the meaning the Hopi tell, of a "backdoor out of the Americas".

A positive note on being American pertains here to all, not just citizens of the United States but to the universal voice of humanity. "On the Pulse of Morning", an Inauguration Day poem presented January 20, 1993 by Maya Angelou, identifies the Journey we share in being of one mind. Reciprocity and a shared social order has long been identified in social systems now lost to the capitalist manifesto. Bringing proven methodologies into today's society should be the primary function of anthropology.

Alfred R. Wallace was also a champion of European social reform. Wallace recognizing the plight of children and women in the industrialized work force, the perils facing the indigenous and their way off life, and the dire effects of accumulation of wealth by the few. These views left him outside of mainstream philosophical orientation. In light of his Einsteinium-like concerns for a one-world government, he remained to his death a respected champion and a visionary who held that anthropology must address the need for social reform. In fact, his dedication to meet these goals in his lifetime are known to foreshadow his profound contribution to the idea of "natural selection" more often attributed to Darwin.
