

CHAPTER III SETTING A NEW COURSE

The European discovery of “unknown worlds” has accelerated the course of European domination. This is true when examining how history has been interpreted and in some cases the directives of how the past is perceived. The discovery of the Americas was, in essence, a verification that unknown worlds existed beyond the eye of the beholder and/or beholden. European explorations unlocked the world to cultural exchange. One example, Marco Polo’s opening of the Silk Road and trade between the ancient Orient and Europe. Before this ancient Phoenician navigators of the Mediterranean were circling Africa and supplying the Egyptians with spices from the Orient. Discovery is more often than not, rediscovery.

Christopher Columbus initiated the inevitable discovery of the “New World”. In the least, he is credited with convincing the most desperate European Queen Isabella to explore a shorter route to “riches and wealth,” even if it was not from the same world he died believing he had found. Scientifically based assessments of the time suggested that Asia lay well beyond the reach of the supplies Columbus and his crew possessed. It was hoped that outlying islands beyond Japan would be found, not just a continent or two. Fifteenth Century cartographers believed that the world was indeed not flat. They held the belief that Columbus and his crew would have to rely on trust that there would be found unknown islands to secure the sustenance of life before reaching Japan. Columbus’s discovery was not a small nomadic feat given that he was willing to risk his and the life of his potentially mutinous crew on unknown calculations of the breadth of the Atlantic Ocean. Columbus’s discovery was inevitable although few of us know that this was professed by Native Americans. It seems certain that one world would find the other while it does little good to blame the result from the last, and most enduring discovery, on Columbus alone. Certainly the Roman Catholic Church has come to accept some of the blame for the atrocities that have befouled the expansion of it’s dominion!

Another example of human exploration can be found in the voyages of the Polynesians. Could they too have wanted for fresh water and food in their explorations of the Pacific and how were they able to find their own passage? Scientists have long wondered, were their colonization’s planned or the result of folly. And what do we make of the other continents that the Polynesians should also be credited with discovering, if only for themselves? Could they have even circled the globe as genetic, linguistic, archaeological, and historical evidence supports? What beguiled Columbus’ discovery is that he would never agree that he had discovered, for the European, a new World, while for the Polynesians the complexity of their own accomplishments seem to be underestimated or lost to history. Their impact on the isolated islands they were the first to discover and on pre-existing peoples who settled less remote Oceania has yet to be fully appreciated. Were they the first peoples to circumnavigate the world? The extent of Polynesian influence on pre-existing cultures may hold valuable lessons for today. What we have yet to learn of their explorations provides another example of the conservative nature of science. Explanations connected with Polynesian exploits will be examined.

These illustrations are used to explain by example that anthropological science, in exploring the past, must accept the obligation to test alternatives when philosophical givens offer imprecise conclusions. Unbiased objectivity in science includes an obligation to investigate alternatives that might challenge the accepted norm. The thirst for mankind's "wellspring" remains to be quenched. In light of over a hundred-and-forty years of anthropological investigation (and countless thousand of hours of research and funding to do so), we seem no closer to a resolution than we were when the first anthropologists began this scientific investigation. It was inevitable that our species would discover the other hemisphere, but what was the first one, the one that conceived our being. It was also inevitable that we would rediscover the ancestors that we left behind once we set out beyond the confines of our original homeland. Contained in these unbelievable stories, retained in the minds of Indigenous People everywhere, is the inspiring history of the human and his travels upon the Earth.

The evolution of American anthropology and archaeological began with the Speculative (1492-1840), continued through the Classificatory-Descriptive (1840-1914), and into the Classificatory-Historical Period (1914-1940). The development of the science of mankind's past has extended into the present, describing and resolving many issues through accurate interpretations based on methodology applied to verified archeological discoveries. Yet, despite various successes over the past 160 years, the fact remains that finding a pre-Clovis or paleoarchaic site (Pre-dating 12,000 y.b.p.) could once have ruined one's career.

The existence of Ice Age Americans, who left little behind to indicate that they were there in the first place, requires a redefinition of what the most ancient Amerindians did to maintain their way of life in pre-Clovis times. It also requires anthropologists to determine how they came to subsist in the Americas in such a surprisingly undemonstrative way as site assessments from Monte Verde, Pedra Ferada, Meadowcroft Rockshelter and others would seem to indicate. Clearly, the traditional archaeological signposts do not favor archaeologist's when it comes to finding verifiable evidence to support pre-Clovis occupations in the Americas. We will see that since the turn-of-the-last-century almost every interpretation supporting great antiquity for man in the Americas has been constrained by either the limited evidence itself or a theory that would help guide these discoveries. This may be because the sciences involved in investigating human origins have accepted the philosophical given that Indians could not have originated in the Americas thus removing the objective to ascribe that the pre-Clovis represents an evolutionary stage of man before Clovis.

It was believed by many, that the Native American reached the New World in Glacial times, while few scholars believed that the date might be pre-Pleistocene as noted earlier.¹ The idea of a Pleistocene occupation (the Glacial epoch that began 3 million years ago), is disputed partly due to the fact that the genus *Homo* has already been dated in the Old World beyond the Pleistocene. Apparently, there would be little significance in finding evidence from the New World if the evidence at hand was always of the modern type. But there may be a lot more to this story and we have recently only cracked the surface of the New World primate record. We must remember that evidence of *Homo*, dating beyond the beginning of the last Glacial (40,000 y.b.p.), are assigned to a species that is not anatomically modern or more specifically, directly related to true *Homo*

¹ see Willey and Sabloff, 1980, page 50.

sapiens. The plates in **Figure 3** are presented to help in discerning relationships between New and Old World primates and inferences this book feels can be clearly illustrated.

3/1 A New Model of the Procession to Paleolithic Behavior

The New World mid-Pleistocene archaeological record offers an unexplored alternative for the evolutionary lifestyles that may have been practiced before the formation of the Upper and Late Paleolithic and Later Stone Ages defining the initial Old World modern human archaeological record. Since many authorities have come to modify their earlier assessments (by now accepting the existence of "pre-Clovis" and/or "paleoarchaic" occupations), perhaps it is time to bring into play Alexander the Great's proverbial Sword and release the knot that ties Gordius' chariot to the post. Explanations offering compatible solutions for even - why the Mousterian Problem exist's - must accompany observations approbative of pre-Clovis occupation.

What is the significance of an Ice Age habitation of the Americas? My view offers an easier, more accommodating, paradigm, that demands testing. Should acceptance of pre-Clovis dates become the consensus opinion a broader evaluation should be welcomed. Anthropological studies implying human evolutionary hypotheses have rarely promoted inquiries into an autochthonous origin of man in the Americas, those tendered concerns central to turn-of-the-Century convictions of Chamberlain, Ameghino, Wallace, Sidis, Lummis, Whitney, and others. Clearly, the initial presence of mankind in the Americas remains unresolved while many anthropologists and archaeologists point to the Old World to define the "unsubstantiated" perspectives held by advocates of a "pre-Clovis" or "paleoarchaic" presence of man in the Americas (Jelinek 1992). Why are these paleoarchaic or pre-Clovis sites seen as Archaeo-logically flawed. Should the dating of humans in the Americas in mid-Pleistocene times be accurate (or greater than 33,000; or 47,000 y.b.p.), then a new paradigm to guide New and Old World observations should drawn. By discounting them as too early to afford comprehension is not good science. Explanations are required.

3/1 The unexpected difficulty in defining the transitional elements - or lack of - leading to the presence of Upper Paleolithic cultural behavior has led to a valid concern in resolving the presence of the "Mousterian Problem." That is, archaeological investigations into the transitional causation leading to the cultural revolution or true Upper Paleolithic behavior in Europe has yet to be resolved. This European transition from Middle to Upper Paleolithic can be seen to occur at relatively the same time as in other continents; in Asia a transition from Middle to Late Paleolithic (Mochanov, 1980) and in Africa; from Acheulian and Early Stone Age and then the sudden arrival of the *modern* Later Stone Age (Parkington, 1991).² The ideas of science changing perspectives is championed by Steven Gould in his own *reevaluation* of the paleontological evidence

² White op. cit., 1983; Binford L. R., *Faunal Remains at Klasies River Mouth*. New York: 1984, Academic Press; Klein Richard G., "Age (mortality) Profiles as a Means of Distinguishing Hunted Species from Scavenged Ones in Stone Age Archaeological Sites," *Paleobiology* 1982, 8:151-158.; and "The Stone Age Prehistory of Southern Africa. *Annu Rev Anthropology* 1983, 12:25-48; Mellars, and authors therein, op. cit., 1991; Binford L. R., "Theory and Method," In *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, edited by S. R. Binford and L. R. Binford 1968b. Parkington, John, "A Critique of the Consensus View on the Age of Howieson's Poort Assemblages in South Africa," in Mellars op. cit. 1991, pp. 34-55, cit. made p. 51.

and theories supporting the sudden extinctions that do now seem to conform with the Cretaceous/Tertiary boundary.

Objectivity is not an unobtainable emptying of mind but a willingness to abandon a set of preferences when the world seems to work in a contrary way...Good theories invite a challenge but do not bias the outcome...We can now sense the power of Darwin's argument about needing theories to guide observations...We say, in our mythology, that old theories die when new observations derail them. But too often, indeed I would say usually, theories act as straitjackets to channel observations toward their support and to forestall data that might refute them. Such theories cannot be rejected from within, for we will not conceptualize the potentially refuting observations...New theories are to this conceptual block what Harry Houdini was to straitjackets.³

The New World evidence confirmed by stone lined hearths, equatorial based subsistence strategies, cave paintings, woven material, and bone, wood, and simple stone tools associated with these industries, do imply an archaeologically "cultured" level. They do however contain a less than refined stone engendered technology, at least, when compared to either European Mousterian and/or Middle or Upper Paleolithic activities.

Pre-Clovis sites defy justification because their simplistic nature lacks evidence of Old World sophistication. Simply, the earliest New World Amerindian substance behaviors run counter to Old World archaeological observations. The New World evidence is halled by the intolerable arguments presented by 'skeptics' perpetually attempting to criticize the veracity or validity of archaeologists and their associated finds. It is time to solicit a renewed appraisal of the antiquity of the indigenous people of the Americas, not only through the acceptance of existing undated fossils found in ancient Pleistocene or even Tertiary deposits, but also through new digs by archaeologists using present advancements in scientific technique. A resolution to the early man debate may be as simple as (i) accepting a need to determine the age of the fossil evidence that currently exists and (ii) acknowledging that there are many potential locations to search for additional physical support. Objectively analyzing the potential of any New World evidence to solve the quest for the origins of our human ancestors is at the crux of my argument.

Part 2

The Paradigm

This book now draws our attention to the "Peopling of the Old World" by Native Americans. Recurring Pleistocene barriers certainly presented foreboding obstacles to human migration delaying what was an inevitable migration beyond North America. By identifying the existence of these physical barriers, it must be assumed that migrations by *Homo sapiens* into northeast Asia from the Americas did not occur until 43,000 years ago when the earliest un-refutable archaeological evidence of the modern peopling of the Old World (Siberia) begins to first appear.⁴ Be this the case, it could be assumed that *Homo sapien's* first migration "out the backdoor to the Americas" must have been after the

³ Gould, Steven J., Dinosaures in the Haystack. *Natural History* 3/92 pp. 4-6

⁴ Kara-Bon

proceeding deglaciation and before the last glaciation (between 55,000 and 38,000 y.b.p.) with the timing of this exodus accompanying a period of deglaciation. Subsequent isolation during the Wisconsin Glacial (38,000 to 12,000 y.b.p.) explains the delay of the diffusion of Upper Paleolithic advancements in reaching back into the Americas and pre-Clovis People virtually coinciding with the end of the last Ice Age. This interpretation counters the “Clovis First” archaeologist’s contention that the “first Americans” were unable to penetrate this formidable barrier until its demise 12,000 years ago. Their focus is on how and when the first Amerindians arrived south of the ice sheets 12,000 years ago, not when pre-Clovis and Old World Amerindians regained contact.

What was the world like 45,000 years ago when our ancestors first settled the Eastern Hemisphere? What were the extent of geographic boundaries and what effect did they have on the first fully modern human dispersal’s that are believed to coincide with the accession of *Homo sapiens* throughout the World? Forty thousand years ago we would find Glacial distribution and Ocean Sea Levels much as they are today. For example ‘northern’ North America, Asia, and Europe would have limited glaciation while Greenland would appear much as it does today, principally glacial. The Bering Straits would separate northeast Siberia from Alaska (by ~40 miles), Australia would have been roughly the same distance from Timor as it is today, 250 miles. Madagascar would (also by 250 miles) have remained humanly uninhabited off the southeastern African coast in the Indian Ocean.

The Earth’s landscapes during and after glacial epochs are dramatically influenced by these inter-related geographic factors, miens that are in constant flux. Sea levels drop during glaciation exposing land masses that are currently “continental shelves”. For example, episodes of glaciation with an accompanying lowering of “sea levels” will again connect most of Island Indonesia thus enlarging Asia’s continental expanse. Canada will then be, once again, a frozen wasteland, if you will, literally covered by a sea of Glacial Ice.

If we look back and examine the available corridors to human migration, as dramatically effected by these two oscillating factors we will find that the appearance of the “Bering Land Bridge” coincides with lowering Sea Levels. But, more importantly, the lowering of Sea Levels also close the door to the Americas, when northern North America becomes blanketed in a mile or two of Glacial Ice. In Australia the scene is reversed. Here, the Islands of Borneo and Indonesia become part of a greater Asia, helping explain the presence of primates who traveled to these (now detached) Islands when they were connected to Asia. We also know that *Homo erectus* made it to Java when it was part of greater Asia. But here they stopped as “marsupial” Australia remained beyond Asia’s furthest shore, isolated by the “Wallace Trench”.⁵

And so, you might ask, what does the Wallace Trench and the Bering Land Bridge have to do with our search for human origins? By examining these separate corridors of human migration the timing of our species human Diaspora can be placed into a worldly framework. You see, the Bering Sea was no more formidable a barrier to human migration than was the Straits of Timor, that separates Java and Timor from the continent of Australia. But it was *Homo sapiens* who first crossed the Timor Straits to Australia and so too, were *Homo sapiens*, the first primate to cross the Bering Sea.

⁵ so named for the great purveyor of “evolutionary theory”, who answered Darwin’s ‘riddle’ of the Origin’s of species while working on the Indonesian Island of Ternate.

Australian Coastal Migration: an Example of Continental Settlement Patterns

Fifteenth century interpretations assumed that Christopher Columbus was the first explorer to discover the "New World," for him the East Indies, in 1492. Later it was found that Viking ships had been crossing the North Atlantic to Nova Scotia 500 years earlier. Several hopelessly lost Chinese and Japanese vessels have been thought to be saved by landfall in the Americas, perhaps as long as 2,600 years ago. The recent discovery of the Red Paint People provides evidence that 6,500 years ago an Arctic tribe of indigenous American Indians had been hunting and exploring parts of Northern Europe. Finally, Eskimo and Aleut descendants of probable Siberian, Athapascan and/or North American origins have been settling the Arctic North for 8 to 10 thousand years. These "first" trans-hemispheric migrations and contacts were accomplished with the aid and invention of seagoing craft. Knowledge of open sea navigation developed by Polynesians less than 3,600 years ago led not only to the discovery of Hawaii and Easter Island but Madagascar of the African coast. These later Island discoveries entailed seagoing technologies that are not related to the first settlement of Australia, 35,000 years earlier as only 60 miles separated Australia from Timor during the Last Ice Age.

When examining modern human dispersal's it is important to focus on just before the onset of the last Pleistocene epoch 43-38,000 years ago. It is then that the "Back Door" out of the Americas was free of the encumbrance of Glacial Ice. Less than 5,000 years later would - once again - glacial advance would lower sea levels both opening and closing geographic doors to human migration. We will examine throughout this book, the Native American contention that, "the Back Door" out of the Americas brought our ancestors across the Bering Sea into a new world, a world we now call the Old World. It is in unmasking the riddles of time that Great Mysteries are to be revealed. It is in correctly understanding our human past that we can bring true awareness of the journey we continue to compose.

We can confirm the first human arrival into the Australian continent from Java across the 60 mile Timor Straits (Joseph Birdsell, 1977) at 39,500 + 2300 - 1800 years with the Radiocarbon dating [carbon 14; c-14] of the Upper Swan River discoveries made by R.H. Pearce and M. Barbetti in 1981. Despite the nearly 300' lowering of ocean seas during the Wurm Glaciation, we can only assume that this migration must be credited to seagoing craft. Nigel Calder (1983) writes in his book Timescale (1983) that:

"The talkative hunters put to sea right away, otherwise they could not have reached Australia so promptly: even allowing for the low sea levels of the ice age, they had to cross a minimum of ninety kilometers of open ocean to reach the island continent. Seagoing craft were therefore available from the very earliest times, for fishing, transport, and migrations. ." (emphasis mine)

The advent of coastal boat travel is confirmed by evidence of the first human migration into Australia. This technology could very well account for the sudden appearance of anatomically modern humans throughout the Eastern Hemisphere 40,000 years ago. Simply, refinements in coastal navigation would have accelerated human migration, not only into Australia, but throughout the Eastern Hemisphere.

Bone Cave is one of a number of limestone caves in the southwest of Tasmania, Australia that have produced a rich record of Pleistocene human occupation spanning the period from 10,000 to 35,000 BP. This paper reports the results of a technological analysis of 23,000 stone artefacts excavated from Bone Cave. Artefacts found at the site were manufactured from both local and imported stone, and suggest a variety of reduction strategies. Twenty-nine radiocarbon determinations from the site permit a precise chronology to be constructed that indicates the site was abandoned for substantial periods between occupations during the late Pleistocene. Stone artefact assemblages constructed on the basis of the radiocarbon determinations are compared through time to determine the significance of these periods of abandonment. Also considered are the effects of differing temporal scales of resolution on measures of assemblage variability. p. A9⁶

The first human (primate) occupation of Australia, New Guinea, and Tasmania nearly 40 thousand years ago may in fact predate the earliest C-14 dates of *Homo sapiens* in Africa. This parallels the radiation of *Homo sapiens* throughout the Old World, being consistent with a modern human arrival marking a sudden and widespread emergence of our species.

Other Clues to *Homo Sapiens* First Arrival

The Classificatory Tribal System could link the initial appearance of modern man in Australia with the Americas as similarities in cultural systems suggest. Henry T. Lewis points to remarkable affinities in aboriginal methods of securing, improving, and maintaining territorial boundaries through resource enhancements, including fire.

"With the emergence of studies in fire ecology, anthropologists are beginning to appreciate the significance that these activities had for hunter/gatherer adaptations. . . Even today this 'forgotten side of ethnogeography, as Omer C. Stewart called it more than 25 years ago (1954), receives relatively little attention, despite the fact that fire has enormous potential for influencing, negatively or positively, the availability of selected resources. . . The presentation of evidence from North America and Australia is...that fire was used by hunter/gatherers to influence the diversity of plants and animals."⁷

The manifestation of the immense potential of fire technology to expand ecological biomes can be demonstrated by the once tremendous number of American Bison (estimated at 60 million in the 1800's). The vast dispersion of these great herds throughout the Great Plains and into and beyond the eastern realm of the Appalachian Mountains (through the Cumberland Gap) can be credited to the Indo-American practice of systematic yearly burning. The Aurignacian tool kit, which also included fire technologies, quickly spread across the *new* Old World its diffusionist character of improving the potential of hunting and gathering habitats. The *great leap forward* into the Upper Paleolithic brought about hunting technologies, ultimately superseding Mousterian Scavenger/Gatherer systems. As has been suggested as a basic component of the Clovis First scenario, the adaptations to new unexplored environments led to the invention of new technologies. These adaptations spread with man as he conquered these new

⁶ Holdaway, S. Stone artefact assemblage variability and scales of temporal resolution at Bone Cave, Tasmania, Australia. *Abstracts for the Paleoanthropology Society Meetings*. p. A9

⁷ 1979 Henry T. Lewis, *Resource Managers: North American and Australian Hunter/Gatherer Societies*

environments. If you turn the table on this hypothesis you find the same pattern fits better when interpreting the diffusion of hunting technologies in the Old World, where such advancements appear earlier than in the Americas.

Kinship systems, fire technologies, human language, and other “cultural” components help us in discerning the arrival of our species in the old World. These technologies simply go back to a time before we arrived in the Eastern Hemisphere. The one advancement that seems to be missing in the Americas at the same time, (40,000 years ago), is the main element defining the Paleolithic, stone as a refined technology. It is not that I don’t wish that a Paleolithic stage existed in the Americas before it did in the Old World for certainly this would allow archaeologists to define an earlier human presence in the Americas. No, the problem is not one in the same as the trickster is forcing us to observe. The direction of technological achievement that spawned the Upper Paleolithic are rooted in adaptation to new environments and these new environments that produced the first true modern hunter/gatherer societies lie outside the Americas.

These evolving adaptations had dire effects on landscapes and vegetation in places where man was a newcomer, this being no more evident than in Australia. Cultural authority through resource management was inherently applied to newly acquired lands throughout the Eastern Hemisphere. However, the occurrence of Fire as a resource tool may help in dating the arrival of humans, as it may have led to extinctions of previously isolated animal groups. Island Polynesia offers another example where once isolated *native* residents (both animal and plant) succumbed to human activities. In fact, extinctions can help us in dating the arrival of our species. In contrast, the arrival of Upper Paleolithic technologies into the Americas < 12,000 years ago is characterized by the dawn of Paleoindian Traditions and hunting technologies that contributed to the extinction of more than 36 genera of animals. Here people already inhabited the Americas while, apparently, pre-Clovis lifeways must have been in balance, drawn from an *in-situ* behavioral evolution.

Similarities between New and Old World hunter/gatherer societies might date back to the initial presence of modern human forms: the Howieson Poort Industry in Africa, Australoid industries, and the San Dieguitan industries of Texas Street in Southern California. Not only are fire technologies similarly founded, so is the use and demographic presence of language families, the classificatory tribal system, and cultural practices. Whether or not the first modern humans of Siberia, Australia, Europe, and Africa are similar endowed in a Paleolithic system can be countered in the differing examples of lithic technologies. It is apparent that Australia was colonized three times; the first native Aborigines, the second Polynesians, the third Europeans. However, the use of fire technologies to improve hunter/gatherer habitats in Australia dates back to when animal extinctions occurred.⁸

Evidence reported earlier this year supported the link between human invasions and animal extinctions, but it raised a new hypothesis to explain the connection. The early human residents of Australia may have killed off animals indirectly by setting

⁸ Richard Monastersky 1999. The Killing Fields. *Science News* Vol. 156 pg. 360. There are no hearths yet found within hominid site occupations while this technology is commonly distinguished only from modern human contexts. Fire associated with hearths from pre-Clovis America pre-date their occurrence in the Old World

widespread fires that altered the mix of vegetation, according to researchers at the University of Colorado at Boulder (SN: 1/9/99, p. 21.”

But what is to be made of the original colonization of Australia. Is it contemporary or earlier than the rest of the Old World?

“But that's a big if. The significance of the site hinges on its age, and many scientists are skeptical about the dating, which was done with a relatively new technique called thermoluminescence (TL). "Unbelievable," says archaeologist John Beaton of the University of California, Davis. These dates are wildly out of line with everything else we know." Even archaeologist Rhys Jones of the Australian National University in Canberra, who last year made waves by dating two other Australian sites to 60,000 years with the same method (*Science*, 31 March 1995, p. 1908), warns that until more tests have been done, "we do not know how valid the present TL claims are (pg. 33)."⁹

The evidence suggesting an earlier presence of modern humans in Australia requires a theory to go along with the TL dates. Animal extinctions offer compatible evidence as recently as the associated arrival of the first people to settle remote Polynesia and Madagascar. Simply, modern human arrivals are believed to be less than 50 years ago in Asia, Europe, and/or Africa. My hypothesis for accepting an *in-situ* origin for mankind from the Americas (collaborated by the very early dates from Brazil, Chile, and North America), follows that, sophisticated behaviors archaeologically associated with the first modern peopling of the Old World were produced as a result of adaptation brought on by the exploration of the Eastern Hemisphere. The lack of an earlier extinction in the Americas suggests that mankind's cultural roots can be traced to less sophisticated forager/gatherers. It is in these limited definitions from pre-Clovis America that mid-Pleistocene Amerindian occupations do not accompany animal extinctions. The development of new subsistence strategies - associated with modern human occupations of the Old World - were isolated from the Americas until the end of the last Ice Age when the refinements defining the Paleolithic found their way into the Americas, distinguishing the dawn of Paleoindian Industries.¹⁰

Population Formation in Australia

Regional population differences can be distinguished at the molecular level, and this is true for Australians.

“Australians have a haplotype repertoire that is shared with New Guinea highlanders, a fact that strongly supports a common origin of these two populations. Further, Australians and New Guinea highlanders have a different set of haplotypes from Southeast Asians and a lower genetic diversity. This, coupled with the presence of many locally specific central Australian haplotypes, suggests that much of the original diversity was lost in a population bottleneck prior to or during the early colonization of Sahul and that subsequent recovery of diversity *has been accompanied by the generation of new haplotypes*. These conclusions contrast with some previous genetic studies suggesting links between Australians, coastal New Guineans, and present-day Southeast Asians. Much of this discrepancy appears to be due to more recent Southeast Asian

⁹ Constance Holden 1996, Art Stirs Uproar Down Under. *Science*, Vol 274, October 4,

¹⁰ These Traditions do not exist in Australia.

[*Melanesian/Polynesian*] admixture on the north coast of Australia (pg. 1017). (*emphasis added*)”¹¹

Geographic constraints suggest;

“At times of lowered sea levels due to glaciation, the islands of Java, Borneo, and Bali were joined with Vietnam and the Malayan peninsula to form the large continent of Sunda. For any expanding or displaced Asian population of modern humans with seafaring abilities, Sahul was accessible throughout the late Pleistocene, requiring, on occasion, a sea voyage of perhaps only 70 km. *The archaeological record suggests that migration also continued eastward of New Guinea, resulting in the occupation of the Bismarck archipelago and the northern Solomon Islands by 30,000 years ago. (emphasis added)*”¹²

These authors cast significant light on the unrelatedness of the later populations of Polynesians that I believe populated not only coastal Australia and New Guinea but Indonesia and other southeast Asian continental areas. The Polynesians came from the Americas where the 9bp deletion is found in its most ancient source population.

“In the present study, we have characterized the a-globin gene complex of Australians from one tribe in central Australia. In contrast to Tsintsof et al. (1990), we find convincing evidence of strong links with New Guinea highlanders, implying that migrations into ancient Sahul originated from a single source population. We suggest that more recent gene flow from island Southeast Asia, resulting in the aboriginal populations on of the north and northwest coasts of Australia becoming admixed, explains some of the ambiguous results of previous studies (*emphasis added*)”¹³

This study demonstrates that the a-globin haplotype composition of central Australians is similar to those of the coastal and highlands populations of New Guinea. All these populations feature high frequencies of the IIIa Haplotype and the presence of IVa and IVb haplotypes. The distribution of group III and IV haplotypes is relatively restricted outside of Australia and Melanesia, although they are found in some African populations. The central Australian population is closest to the New Guinea highlanders, consistent with other genetic and archaeological data suggesting that the early occupation of Sahul included both Australia and New Guinea and that these people migrated from a common Southeast Asian source (pg. 1021).

Here the rarity of the 9bp deletion in Africa can be traced to Madagascar and the 70% of the population that original colonized the Island < 2,200 years ago. Here too animal extinction’s can be used in dating the arrival of man, Polynesians from Borneo.

The central Australians, by contrast, have negligible levels (1/200) of the most common haplotypes that characterize Southeast Asians, and, conversely, the rare haplotype groups found in central Australians have never been observed in Southeast Asia (authors' unpublished observations). All these findings imply that central Australia has remained isolated from island Southeast Asia for many millennia (pg. 1022).

¹¹ J.M. Roberts-Thomson, J.J. Martinson, J.T. Norwich, R.M. Harding, J.B. Clegg, and B. Boettcher 1996 An Ancient Common Origin of Aboriginal Australians and New Guinea Highlanders Is Supported by a-Globin Haplotype Analysis. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 58:1017-1024,

¹² (Bellwood 1978; Gosden 1993) (pg. 1017).

¹³ (ibed, pg. 1018)

Both aboriginal Australians and New Guinea highlanders have notably low genetic diversity at a-globin and other loci, and this has been interpreted in previous studies as a result of isolation and long-term small population sizes. However, it is possible that the original diversity was lost in a population bottleneck prior to or during the occupation of Sahul. Also, it is likely that *the genetic differences found between central Australians and the New Guinea highlanders are due to the accumulation of new haplotypes*, generated by mutation and recombination, rather than to drift in generational sampling, as would be expected if population sizes remained small. *There is no evidence that these rare haplotypes derive from populations now settled in island Southeast Asia.* The presence of locally specific haplotypes suggests moderate population sizes and low rates of gene flow among these regions. The *nonequilibrium* distribution for the central Australian aboriginal sample is consistent with population expansion, generated by natural recruitment rather than immigration. Following the bottleneck that occurred in an ancestral population of both Australia and New Guinea, diversity has been recovering by the incorporation of new haplotypes (pg. 1023). (all emphasis *added* AMH)

There are several inferences I would like to draw from the data presented here. One; some coastal population admixture with Polynesians (< 36,000 ybp) can be assumed against the backdrop of interior or highland populations of the original (>35,000 ybp) colonizers of Sahul. Two; New Guineans, and Central Australians are believed to have shared an earlier common ancestry that has diverged following the formation of the present interior Southeast Asian populations, including interior. Three; New Guineans and Central Australians Populations were at one time contiguous but soon broke away from an emerging Central Asian phylogenetic tree. Four; it is fair to assume Polynesian migration into coastal and Island southeast Asia and Africa accounts for the widespread distribution of the *9bp* deletion (see Hicks, this volume pg.). Fifth, and central to the data presented here; an actual phenotype "mitochondrial Eve" from Africa can not be identified (see Johnson et al 1983; Templeton 1993).

One would have to conclude that when man creates art the meanings contained in the picture or form can be viewed as only part of a greater story or message. The expression of a greater story can be interpreted by the representation of art even when they are not presented in a series. The continuation of mythical translations and the inheritance of behavior, tribal interaction and use of animals, plants, and natural elements as spiritual allies is rooted in original people's societies. It is evident that tribal structure and social interaction is founded in tradition and passed down through myth. As a result religious and cultural relatedness and tribal behavior is a shared condition contained in the heart of aboriginal society, as convergent or divergent as our own DNA.

This cultural expression dating to a time before *when man first* became manfirst in the Old World, carried there by modern humans from the Americas. The Old World arrival into Siberia, Australia, Japan, all the way to Southern Africa is marked by an evolving Paleolithic Industry that was the result of adaptation to Old World environments. One would expect numerous cultural similarities including fire technologies and the Classificatory Tribal System (Morgan 1864) would link later Australian aborigines with ancestral native American Indians. Carter makes this point.

"When I graduated in anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley, we had to take senior examinations and write a senior essay.... I chose to compare the southern California Indians with the Australians. I pointed out that they not only had Australoid physical traits but they shared ceremonies, ... even the pattern of stone tool

making was similar. In both Australia and southern California, stone was worked unifacially, and originally there were no bifaced points or knives, and stone tools were not hafted but hand held. It is a formidable list of comparisons to have “just happen.” It is much more reasonable to expect a historical connection and, since the people of America and of Australia both came out of Asia, to look to Asia for the ancient common root for both the physical men and their culture. In this case we have the interesting connection of a race type and a culture type. This analysis suggests that it was the Australoids who bore the planoconvex lithic tradition.... When one adds to that curved throwing sticks, spear throwers, ceremonial stone alignments, initiation ceremonies with such peculiarities as exclusion of the females and warning them by use of the bull roarer, the evidence of ancient connection becomes too extensive to be lightly dismissed.” (Carter, 1979)

The earliest Australian and pre-Clovis-like New World lithic industries (Texas Street, Calico, Buchanan Canyon, Santa Rosa Islands, Lake Mannix Basin, etc.) are indicative of sapient behavior associated kinship systems, fire technologies and other culturally related activities. The direction of this relationship however, is challenged by mainstream anthropologists because lithic tools associated with pre-Clovis finds lack the refinements gained in the colonization of unknown worlds. Couldn't we *Homo sapiens* have originated in the Americas without the advancement of Projectile Points used for hunting? This alternative, supported by the limitations archaeologically conformant, presents the only substantiatable argument affording the pre-Clovis lithic component. mistakenly categorize them as “geo-facts” (works of nature). The lack of stone projectile points in the earliest coastally occupied areas of Australia has parallels with the Americas, implying that the earliest migrations had yet to develop certain lithic technologies just beginning to emerge in Europe. The presence of evolving “Paleolithic industries” can be argued to support coastal migrations as the simplest method for explaining the near convergence of C-14 dates accompanying the “sudden arrival” of modern humans throughout the Eastern Hemisphere precisely 35-45,000 years ago.

3/2 The Exit

3/2 Obvious differences, including cranial and skeletal features, anatomically distinguish Old World *Homo erectus* from anatomically Modern *Homo sapiens*. But the uniqueness of our species does not stop there. Our species arrival into the Old World also coincides with an archaeological evolution of Paleolithic tool types, and with it, the first indications of *sapiens* behavior. Verified interpretations imply that a vast physical and cultural change occurred virtually simultaneously (spanning 5,000-10,000 years), throughout the Eastern Hemisphere. The time frame, measured by chronological based archaeological associations combined with Carbon-14 dating procedures manifests the fact that modern humans began their domination of the Eastern Hemisphere at the beginning of the Asian Late Paleolithic + 40,000 years ago. Coastal migration was an important Late Paleolithic endeavor, providing fully modern humans with access across the Timor Sea that separated Java and the greater Australian continent that included New Guinea. Simply, the Wallace Trench had forever confounded Old World primate's access to Australia, including *Homo erectus*. The sudden appearance of our species throughout the Old World can be placed in time to relatively close to the time of mankind's first colonization of Australia.

There remains a great deal of skepticism that modern humans would remain in one specific location without some kind of geographic barrier. Archaeological evidence of their initial appearance in, and subsequent colonization of, the Old World indicates that the first hunter/gatherer cultures developed specialized technologies. Although proponents of an African or Asian source origin for *Homo sapiens* sapiens are reluctant to address pre-Upper Paleolithic isolation, there is other evidence that would support a migration of modern humans out of the Americas into Siberia. The geographic constraints imply that this would have been an impressive accomplishment by any standards.

The hypothesis of an isolated modern human presence and evolution from a New World primate base must envision a great obstacle inhibiting a migration from the Western to the Eastern Hemisphere. Glacial expanse in the Western Hemisphere has long been characterized as a formidable barrier south of the Alaskan Frontier. Modern human populations below the North American glacial expanses would have been isolated from the Bering Land Bridge. Timing the presence of glacial expanse with the existence of the Bering Land Bridge would make the availability of a land crossing for American Indians more difficult. In fact, the earliest Americans, in order to exit the Americas, would have had to endure the onset of the Wisconsin I glaciation in Alaska before re-exposure of the previously submerged Bering Land Bridge. Unless they crossed with using boats.

An exit for modern humans from Alaska to Siberia coinciding with decreasing sea levels indicates that man may have used boats to cross the Bering Sea and exit the Americas. One would have to conclude that once glaciation began these now isolated tribal groups may have watched the Siberian Coast come into view. When the distance between Siberia and Alaska became less than 10 miles, these earliest humans may have already been hunting the Siberian coastal biomes, using bone tools for spear-points. Considering the timing of these geologic and geographic events, it would be logical to assume that before the onset of the Würm/Wisconsin Glaciation (45,000 y.b.p.) nomadic forager/gatherers would have already migrated from North America into Alaska. An earlier migration would have presented the same obstacles since miles thick Ice Sheets isolated people in the Americas during previous episodes of Pliocene glaciation. This is why it took so long for *Homo sapiens* to finally exit the Americas.

A by-product of this exploration was advancements including , but not limited to, big game hunting technologies, as indicated by the sole reliance of highly modified bone bone spear points, side and end scrapers, and graters, left by the earliest Alaskan pioneers.¹⁴ These markedly sapient technologies were first invented at the beginning of the Wisconsin I (45,000 ybp), these specialized skills being part of an evolving Late/Upper Paleolithic tool kit that marks the onset of fully modern *Homo sapiens* in the Eastern Hemisphere. Glacial isolation could have prompted the development of bone tool hunting technologies in the Alaskan sub-Arctic, as the archaeological record indicates. Contact with "pre-Clovis" population who remained behind during this exodus is not indicated since sites in the southern Americas continued to conform with the reliance on gathering technologies and are devoid of evidence of specialized big game hunting industries, even of bone.

¹⁴ Morlan 19).

Could the dawn of Upper Paleolithic human behavior - as defined by large game-hunting - be the product of adaptation to available food resources as man exited the Americas? If so, mid-Pleistocene Amerindian subsistence activities continued unchanged, as they had for hundreds of thousands of years. That is, Amerindians who remained in the southern Americas, following the onset of the Wisconsin Ice Age 36,000 years ago, continued to rely on wood, bone, and simple flaked stone tools. Not until the end of the last Ice Age 11,500 years ago did human inhabitants of the Americas practice large game-hunting. Simply, the pre-Clovis era predates the arrival of Paleoindian Traditions. By going full-circle, Upper Paleolithic hunting technologies were introduced late to the Americas (11,600 y.b.p.), following the return of Old World cultures who developed advanced hunting strategies after leaving the Americas (45,000 years ago).

3/2 Two Migrations Separated by the Wisconsin Glacial Epoch

Amerind is not presently understood as descendant of any definite ancestral Old World tongue. The vast linguistic diversity supports the archaeological interpretation that pre-Clovis occupation entails an ancient presence for mankind of the Americas, one that is unrelated to Old World hunting cultures. An earlier isolation of pre-Clovis Amerindians is not only suggested by the lack of archaeological correlates to Paleolithic big game hunting styles but by anthropological evidence of distinctly divergent languages and extensive genetic diversity and a greater age than Clovis-First dictates. There are, however, a few behavioral similarities archaeologically associated between the earliest Amerindians and the first modern Cultures of the Old World. This can be demonstrated by comparing the Howieson Poort Industry of Africa and the Kartan industries of Australia with Santa Rosa Island and La Jolla industries of the New World. For example, stone projectile points are missing in pre-Clovis sites and, as well, the earliest coastally oriented tool kits associated with the first modern peopling of the Old World. Archaeologic evidence presently provides support for an eastern Eurasian origin for the European Upper Paleolithic with stone projectile points being first refined in the later cultures of Europe. Specialized subsistence behaviors are indicated by the sudden Upper Paleolithic presence of sapient behavior that originated outside of Europe.

Are there any similarities to link pre-Clovis New World lithics (Dillehay, personal conversation) the earliest modern lithic industries of Northeast Asia. Could elements of style tie the early Upper Paleolithic (Aurignacian like) lithic industries of Europe, Australia, Klaisies, Northern China, and Siberia with New World sites including Texas Street, Calico Hills, Buchanan Canyon, Yuha Desert, Tlapacoya? Refinements in manufacture could also be tied to the Old World Mousterian industries of the Neanderthal. Pre-Clovis New World bone wood and stone tools share behavioral patterns in association with later Upper Paleolithic not earlier (Mousterian)-industries. High concentrations of stone tool production accompanying the Middle Paleolithic have presented a major stumbling block in accepting pre-Clovis artifacts. I propose that the high variety of specialized use specific tool types comprising bone, antler, and wood tools of the Upper Paleolithic are decendent of behaviors defining earlier modern non-lithic industries of Pleistocene America. This, Old World Upper Paleolithic character, can find correlates in the Calico Hills lithic industries including numerous "small tool types" are distinguished by high workmanship, pressure flaking, tool variety (denticulates, scraper graters, and

skreblos), systematic byfacial retouch, tendencies for selective use of raw materials, specific spatial distribution of specimens and qualitative patterns of lithic attributes.

“Whatever the exact nature of the behavioral differences between modern humans and their ancestors, and of the transition between them there is a plausible case to be made for the argument that the biobehavioral gap was wide, that ‘archaic’ human behavior was different from the behavior of anatomically modern groups, and that we see in the ‘archaic’ the final representatives of a very long phase of human evolution, during which only limited changes took place.... A case can be made that the nomen H. sapiens should apply only to hominids for which modern behavior patterns can reasonably be inferred; another name would then be needed for ‘archaic H. sapiens. (David Pilbeam, 1986)

Whether or not Late Paleolithic lithics from Zhoukoudian and Choukoutian are equivalently descendant from Mousterian lithic assemblages is directly relevant in accepting Calico Lithic material at an age of 200,000 ky. Aurignacian lithic industries exemplify a rapidly evolving technology that led to projectile point industries in Europe that were not found in the earliest African, Australian, or Siberian industries. I would suppose, as I am often caught doing, that the hunting of large game was a specialized adaptation that was the product of non-coastally oriented cultures and their response to selective environmental pressures to improve resource procurement in localized interior biomes.

“Illustrations of bipolar cores duplicate in detail those from southern California, and the ‘wedges’ are suggestively like skreblos found in Siberia. What is interesting about all of this is that such assemblages are present and are easily recognizable as the work of man and that the technology used to produce such work is evident to almost any archeologist—just as long as the suggested antiquity is not beyond the accepted limits for man in America... The industry is described as a well-developed, highly integrated, and functional productive technique. This recalls John Witthoft’s description of the Texas Street blade and core material as the most sophisticated blade and core material known to him in the world.” (Carter, 1979, pgs. 120, 224)

I cannot help but feel support for early lithic technologies found in the Americas as ancestral to Upper Paleolithic applications indicating the arrival of *sapient* behavior in the Old World.

Most of the discussion of Siberian stonework has centered on a few sites in south-central Siberia, near Lake Baikal, for instance. This is nearly 3,000 miles from Bering. It is a bit like discussing Bering Strait in terms of the archeology of California. Most of the Siberian archeology known and reported is clearly upper Paleolithic in time and cultural level. It has bifacially flaked points, struck blades, microblades, and all the trappings well known in Europe and south Russia on the 20,000 and 30,000-year levels. It would not be surprising to find eventually that this represented the expansion to the north and east of the hunters of the great mammals of the north Eurasian forests and the northern grasslands. Perhaps it was a spillover of these people that brought the skills of hunting the huge mammals of the Pleistocene into America via Bering Strait. Or, as suggested earlier, *maybe it was the reverse: American hunters entering Siberia*. There certainly is a continuity of microblade work from Siberia through Alaska into America....When we progressed to thinking of the age of man in America as only 12,000 years, there was little point in looking beyond the Upper Paleolithic material of eastern Siberia. The microblade work there had parallels in America, and so the Asiatic source was accepted without many qualms. We now have moved to dates in America that touch 100,000 years, and this should move us to consider materials in Asia on that time level. It

is by no means certain that we have the ultimate dates for America, for in the Colorado Desert and elsewhere in the West there are sets of steep-edge flaked artifacts that fit no known cultural pattern, and they are weathered beyond all other lithic tool types (Carter, 1979 emphasis added).

The finding of evidence of banked hearths and an Upper Paleolithic human presence in Siberia coincides with the initial development in the Eastern Hemisphere of flaked stone and bone tool industries and with it the "core tool traditions."

A major event in the study of the Paleolithic in northeast Asia was the discovery of the Duyktai cave on the Alden in 1967. . .The distinction of the archaeological sites discovered in the Pleistocene deposits in Yakutia makes them part of a specific Paleolithic culture, which has been termed Duyktai-a culture of hunters for mammoths, woolly rhinoceros, bison, horses, musk oxen, and apparently reindeer. The most indicative elements of the Duyktai culture are bifacial willow leaved, lancet-shaped, and sub triangular flint spearheads, as well as oval and semilunar knives...Judging by radiocarbon data and the mode of occurrence of the Paleolithic finds at Aldan, the Indigirka, the Kolyma, and those in Kamchatka, the Duyktai culture existed in northeast Asia from 35,000 ± 500 to 10,500 years ago. (Ju A. Mochanov 1966, 1972a and b)

Soviet archaeologist Ju Mochanov indicates that the mean January air temperature of the Duyktai cultural area 35,000 years ago was 25 to 30 degrees cooler than those of the coldest Neanderthal populated areas of Eurasia, where banked (stone lined) hearths for cooking and heating had never been developed. The similar cultural foundations associated with the "core tool traditions" and the spread of human populations into Japan and Australia, is highlighted in the late Don W. Dragoo's chapter "The Trimmed Core Traditions in Asiatic-American Contacts" from Early Native Americans edited by Davis L. Browman (1980).

I have stated (Dragoo 1968:176) that on the basis of typological uniqueness, geographic distribution, high degree of patination of tool surfaces, and the similarity of tool types to those of the Paleolithic in the Old World, there are complexes that have been found in the New World which possibly date as early as 40,000 years ago. Similar views of the time involved have been presented by Willey (1966,37), Muller-Beck (1966), Krieger (1964), MacNeish (1971), and others who have attacked the problem of early cultures from different perspectives and have worked in various areas of the New World...I have been impressed with the growing accumulation of evidence for the spread of core tools from the Asiatic mainland to various adjacent island land masses such as Japan, the Philippine Islands, and Australia.

Paleo-Indian adaptations to the sub-arctic Siberian habitat may have brought with it the initial development of "core tool traditions" and later "projectile point industries" that mark the Upper Paleolithic. It was once considered that new world Asian immigrants could not have reached the Western Hemisphere without the invention of the "Trimmed Core Traditions;" or new world fluted Clovis points which appear no earlier than 11,700 years ago.

Alex Krieger's paper (1964) on pre-projectile-point cultures in the New World stirred great controversy; now it is well accepted that the earliest groups in the New World were not fabricating stone projectile points. (D.L. Browman 1980)

The pre-projectile-point industries of the New World are easy to comprehend when we assume that proposed ancestors of the first Americans never crossed the Bering Land Bridge from northeast Asia. Migration into the Americas did not occur until the end of the Last Ice Age and for this reason we do not find stone projectile points in the earliest New World sites.

-- The chronologically based archaeological associations, confirmed by Upper Paleolithic convergence of C-14 dates with sites, validate the sudden appearance of a new "Cultural" orientation marking the dawn of modern *sapien's* behavior throughout the Eastern Hemisphere. Clearly, the earliest migrations by modern humans were expeditious, taking them less than 5,000 -7,500 years to colonize the entire Eastern Hemisphere. Coastal migration has long been identified as the key to human colonization of Australia taking them around the Island Continent before they explored the interior regions. So too would the boat have hastened the arrival of mankind from the backdoor to the Americas, Siberia, to the old World's most distant continent, Africa. Chronological archaeological associations indicate that a coastal boat migration sped the process of migration taking the Amerindian explorers by way of India and the African Horn, to southern Africa by 36,000 years ago. Was the boat for modern man in the Eastern Hemisphere what the spacecraft promises to be for mankind in the 21st century? The modern human colonization of the Eastern Hemisphere is clearly defined by both cultural and physical evidence of sapiens characteristics all dated within the commonly accepted limits (40,000 y.b.p.) of C-14 dating procedures. Specialized bone and lithic industries, core tool traditions, coastal boatmanship and improvements in hunting technologies may have been drawn from the rigors of sub-Arctic isolation and adaptation in Alaska. For this reason alone we find a greater number of visible human locations in the Old World Upper and Late Paleolithic while pre-Clovis sites in the Americas remained unchanging, non-Paleolithic.

A migration from a single source, this Out of Asia with expanding Pliocene populations and an new evolving Old World Upper Paleolithic Industry is compatible with the evidence supporting a recent arrival into Europe of Cro-Magnon people from an as yet determined place of origin. If the Americas was the source of this departure then northeast Asia would be the first stepping stone into the undiscovered Eastern Hemisphere. Archaeological correlations confirm this as both dated material and the course of invention indicate that Asia and Siberia were the source for later migrating groups. Genetics correlates support this emerging picture as well.

3/2 An Amerindian Eve and Old World mtDNA Studies

Could isolated Amerindian tribal populations with similar extensive mitochondrial DNA diversities have been responsible for the "common ancestry" found in Old World population studies - the principal element left supporting the "Eve hypothesis" (Stoneking et al. 1986) - an idea central to the concept supporting a "recent" peopling of the Old World (Cann et al. 1987)?¹⁵ The comparisons drawn between New

¹⁵ The "Out of Africa" argument has been championed since the first discoveries of hominids made by Raymond Dart, (Dart R.A., "The First Human Mandible from the Cave of Hearths," *Makapangat. S. Africa Archaeol. Bull.* 1948, 3: 96-98), and Mary and Louis Leakey in the 1950s. Yet, what kind of an analogy could be drawn by the findings of a modern human presence in Chile and Brazil, a presence that would also

and Old World populations (Ward et al. 1991) and differences defined by “extensive” mtDNA diversities accompanying “Amerindian” molecular analysis can be interpreted as evidence in direct support of a migration of glacially isolated tribal groups *out of the Americas* at the beginning of the Wisconsin Glaciation 45,000 y.b.p. Could the resulting site specific Asian, African and European mtDNA lineages, derived genetic substitutions, have been generated as a result of natural selections on the mtDNAs molecule with this being influenced by selective pressures (Fos et al.1990) and/or effects resulting from the recombination of small hybrid populations during or following expansions into new unpopulated regions? Could an increasing susceptibility to change be detected by the mtDNA genome and/or is the evidence for a common set of founders, as prescribed in the Eve Hypothesis, driven by the circumstances a “rapid replacement” and inter-hemispherical colonization scenario reasons? The discussion of the circumstances pertaining to continental migrations into uncharted continents is well defined by Dillehay (1991). The arrival of mankind into a new set of continents - be it the Americas or the continents of the Old World - has profound implications when identifying Old World colonization by *Homo sapiens* and parallels devoted to arguments offering evidence of a “rapid replacement” of Old World species of hominids not related to the newcomers (Stringer 1989).

Since “Rare Asian mutations” are the only corresponding Asian mtDNAs found in the Americas and whereas they are found in the Americas at “dramatically higher frequencies,” (Schurr et al. 1990), I propose that the *source* for these Amerindian maternal lineages found in northeast Asians was; post glacial migrations emanating from within the Americas (Hicks 1998). Since these lineages are found in much higher frequencies in the Americas and northeast Asians, a proposed secondary migration out of the Americas in post glacial times can be implied (Hicks 1998; Boas 1905, 1910). The forth “rare Asian lineage” [the Region V 9 bp deletion] found in Polynesian and coastal southeast Asians (Harihara et al. 1992) may indicate that trans-Pacific migrations from the Americas (Heyerdahl 1952) may be the source for this lineage, especially since this supposed “founding” lineage is not found in northern Asian and northern Amerindian populations (Shields et al. 1992).¹⁶

The migrations of man into Polynesia and other Pacific Islands and the indications that these recent populations maintain higher frequencies of the ‘Region V 9

be, contemporary to their arrival in Western Europe (from Fagan, Brian, "Tracking the First Americans," in *Archaeology magazine*. 1990, November/December)? Their is plenty of literature contending that the Amerindians originated in Asia including; Greenberg, Joseph H., Christy G. Turner II, Stephen L. Zegura, "The Settlement of the Americas: A Comparison of the Linguistic, Dental, and Genetic Evidence," in *Current Anthropology* 1986. Vol. 27, No. 5.; Laughlin, William, *Aleuts: Survivors of the Bering Land Bridge*. Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York 1980; Szathmary, Eموke J.E., "Peopling of North America: Clues from Genetic Studies," in *Out of Asia: Peopling of the Americas and the Pacific*. edited by R.L. Kirk and E.J.E. Szathmary, Journal of Pacific History, Canberra, 1985, pp. 79-104; and Schurr, Theodore G., Scott W. Ballenger, Yik-Tuen Gan, Judith A. Hodge, D. Andrew Merriwether, Dale N. Lawrence, William C. Knowler, Kenneth M. Weiss and Douglas C. Wallace, "Amerindian Mitochondrial DNAs Have Rare Asian Mutations at High Frequencies, Suggesting They Derived from Four Primary Maternal Lineages" in *American Journal of Human Genetics* 1990, 46:613-623.

¹⁶ Shields Gerald F., Kristen Hecker Mikhail I. Voevoda, Judy K. Reed, "Absence of the Asian- specific Region V Mitochondrial Marker in Native Beringians." *American Journal Human Genetics* 1992, 50:pg. 758-765, cit., p. 759.

bp deletion' (Shields et al. 1992) supports the aforementioned perspective; that these lineages are part of a recent, post Wisconsin migration of Amerindians into Polynesia and coastal Asia from the Americas. Evidence of recently derived populations in Polynesians and other coastal Asian populations (Stoneking and Wilson 1989) suggests that investigation into evidence of "American Indians in the Pacific" should not be dismissed because it remains an anthropological "taboo" (Hyerdahl 1952). The near fixation of the mtDNA Region V 9-*bp* in Polynesians - 139/150 (Shields et al. 1992) - supports evidence of a recent founding/migration from the Americas 3,600 years ago. The rarity of the 'region V 9-bpd' in interior southeast Asia (again, this lineage is missing in northern Asians) and the "suggestion" that this lineage represents a significant founding effect in two remote populations that populated regions 10s of thousands of years apart defies an explanation, or does it? I know of one Norwegian seafarer who has found this observation of great interest.

Again, the conclusion that as few as "four maternal lineages" (including the region V 9***bpd***) are responsible for the colonization of the Americas is based on the 'traditional' estimation that an Asian origin for Amerindians could be demonstrated by comparing Amerindian mtDNAs with Asian lineages. The occurrence of only "rare Asian" lineages in "Amerindian" populations in "dramatically higher frequencies" may alternatively support the "autochthonous" contention; that any evidence encompassing the hypothesis that "Amerindian" populations migrated from Asia can be portrayed as at least controversial or "Dramatic" and, in the end, does not prove that the "Amerind" speaking Indians came from Asia or anywhere else in the Old World. Again, this contention will be addressed at length in Chapter 6.

Finding Old World "Amerindian" Founding Effects

If man was in the New World 25,000 - 35,000 or as geneticists Svante Pääbo, Rebecca Cann and Ryk Ward believe, as early as 40,000 y.b.p., shouldn't "*Amerindian*" *dental traits* be older than the "early modern patterns" (Turner 1987)? Identifying that 92% of the American Indians have sinodont patterns is to say that they have the characteristic shoveling of the incisors while they lack the increased frequencies of three rooted first molars present in northern Asians and Athapascans. Amerindians and Athapascans, however, maintain the same characteristic shoveling of the incisors, an ancient dental pattern present in the early modern types from Niah and Tabon, the presumed ancestors of Australian aborigines. Although there are difficulties in comparing or deriving modern dental characteristics *Homo erectus* or other hominids of the Old World (Brace 1971) it can be said that the American Indians have the least variant dental morphologies of all the world's populations and could imply the maintenance of ancient subsistence patterns akin to plant based subsistence strategies.

The presence of Sinodont dental patterns in the northern Asian peoples again does not verify that the source for these traits could not have been the Americas. Since isolated populations in Australia retain 5 basic sinodontal patterns, (Hanihara 1992) this could support a separate interpretation, suggesting that Sinodontal dental patterns are related to the ancestral dental pattern, not recently derived. Sinodontal dental traits found in living "Amerindian" populations are older than many evolving traits found in Asians suggesting an earlier presence of these patterns in the Americas. Shoveling of the incisors and the

near absence of three-rooted lower first molars are traits found uniformly in “Amerindians” and are found in frequencies that link them with other Sinodontal patterns found in Athapascans, Aleut-Eskimo, and Siberians. They are, closely related to the earliest fully modern Old World humans patterns (Turner 1987) still found in living populations of Aboriginal Australians. “Sinodontology appears in the three skulls from the 18,000-year-old site of Choukoutien in northern China, so it must have evolved sometime earlier, perhaps 30,000 years ago (Turner 1987 p. 6)”. Could this perspective insinuate that the sinodont dental patterns are in fact older than the evolving southeast Asian pattern, sundadont? The Amerindian retention of the highest frequencies of certain Sinodontal patterns and other “Amerind specific” traits (Turner 1987) is compatible with the explanation that the source for the earliest Australians (<40,000-50,000 y.b.p.) can be found in looking to the Americas.

This preliminary evaluation lends further support and in fact may be seen as “resonate” (Ward pers. correspondence) with my own views; that an expanding authentication of genetic studies affords a great antiquity for Amerindian tribal populations. Since “Amerindian” mtDNAs are found in “Polynesian” populations (Paabo et al. 1988) and are rare or nonexistent in southern Chinese, Australian and Micronesian, African, and European populations (Harihara et al. 1992; Stoneking and Wilson 1989), is it possible that these “rare Asian traits” were recently carried out of the Americas? Clearly migrations between the hemispheres must have gone both directions following the melting of the Wisconsin Glacial given the advancements in subsistence strategies (i.e. hunting technologies) that were most likely carried south by Asian population who introduced to the Americas hunting technologies. Since *none* of the Asian specific mtDNA lineages are found in the Americas (Schurr 1990 and Ward and Schurr, personal communication) an alternate explanation can be drawn for the finding of “Amerindian” specific mtDNAs in northeast Asian populations, this being admixture following the end of the last Ice Age. For example, Tibetan or other central Asian populations may have, through admixture, some “Amerindian” specific mt DNAs in low frequencies [i. e. “rare Asian mutations”] the result of northern Mongolian invasions (Fleming pers. communication).

The source for these same “rare Asian mutations” in northern Mongolian populations (who share lower frequencies of these maternally derived Amerindian lineages), may very well be Athapascans who were, earlier, Native Americans. Evidenced of migration into Siberia from North America, in post glacial times represents a second migration “out the Back Door of the Americas.”

New World Pathogens and Old World *Homo erectus* Replacement

The initial presence of modern humans in the Old World is seen in association with a “rapid replacement” of ‘archaic’ Old World hominids and is widely accepted as the only major alternative to the “Multiregional Evolution” theory. Could migrations of humans from the Americas 40,000 y.b.p. have resulted in the introduction of New World diseases leading to the rapid replacement of Old World hominid forms? Is there an alternative to the speculation that a violent genocide of the Neanderthals and other widespread populations of *Homo erectus* occurred at the hands of marauding *Homo sapiens*? Perhaps foreign (New World) disease may have contributed to *their* extinction. A comparative example can be found by examining the near-genocide of the American Indian following the arrival of 15th century Europeans and their introduction of *new* Old

World diseases. The indigenous *Amerindian* susceptibility to many Old World diseases indicates an inherent isolation in the Americas, a presence that directly contradicts the hypothesis of a recent Asian entry for Amerindians.

Research by University of Hawaii geneticist Rebecca Cann suggests;

“the newcomers’ germs may have played a divisive role as modern humans swept into Europe and around the world. Just as European colonists of the 15th century are thought to have killed off more American natives with smallpox and measles than with warfare, Cann believes that an influx of new diseases came with the arrival of the Cro-Magnons, contributing to the demise of the Neanderthals (Allman 1991 p. 57).¹⁷

If one presumes a long evolutionary history for modern humans in the Americas then increased blood polymorphisms in their Old World migratory relations (i. e. Cro-Magnon man and other Old World populations responsible for the “rapid replacement”) could represent specific affinities to biological adaptations to previously unknown environmental factors directed by exposure to *new* Old World pathogens. This idea could indicate that migratory response influences polymorphic adaptations varying the genetic susceptibility found in separate Old World populations. Migrations away from the New World would have had a great potential for increasing the accumulation of new blood types and new mutations on the mtDNA molecule. Could Upper Paleolithic contact between *Homo sapiens* from the New World and Old World hominids as well as exposure to natural pathogens have contributed to blood resistance allies directing adaptations to diseases indigenous to the Old World? The development of new varieties of blood types may have resulted in geographically site-specific adaptations made as modern man colonized new, yet genetically hostile, Old World environments. Since type O blood is inherent to Native American Indians, it could be argued that, it is the ancestral blood type.

Summary

It was inevitable that, *Homo sapiens* would migrate across the Bering Straits and into the Old World. This is evidenced by the onset of European’ Upper, Asian’ Late Paleolithic, and African’ Later Stone Age occupations. Conversely, the uninterrupted character of earlier New World Pleistocene activities and their orientations to forager/gatherer/small game hunting behaviors does not dictate perspectives that would conclude that they entered the New World from Asia. That New World Pleistocene archaeological sites are not characterized by lithic tool types found earlier in the Old World affords an alternative appraisal: 1) that refinements in the complexity of stone tool types found in the Old World archaeological record helps in identifying archaeological sites and 2) our ability to locate *Amerindian* human occupations is not as simple as finding the preservation of lithic tool remains as equatorial subsistence strategies and plant based technologies are not exemplary of the activities or use patterns typically defined by the Old World utilization of stone tools. Could refinements borrowed from Old World hominid tool makers have been refined into the modern lithic and bone tool

¹⁷ Allman, William F., "Who WE Were" in *U. S. News and World Report*, 1991, Sept. 16 pg. 57

using “cultures” of the Upper and Late Paleolithic? Could Northeast Asians have returned to the Americas at the end of the Wisconsin Glaciation to introduce into the Americas a new form of subsistence strategy? The ambiguous nature affording the European ‘transition’ - or lack of evidence of one - from Middle Paleolithic stone tools to Upper Paleolithic tool systems, can be compared with these alternative examples of what happens when isolated populations meet.

Part 3

3/3 Paleontological Evidence

I believe there is a sustainable interdisciplinary approach (combining archaeological, genetic, linguistic, dental, and geographic interpretations and studies), can be used to reason that the evolution of *Homo sapiens* occurred entirely in the Western Hemisphere. I would like to address the favorable fossil evidence and the prospect of it being unearthed again in Nicaragua, Montana, and the Sierra Nevada gold fields of California.

The possibility that 19th Century finds of human cultural and fossil remains in the auriferous gravels of the California gold fields were of Tertiary age was, at that time, unthinkable. The American anthropologists, geologist, and paleontologists of the day, examining the general outlines of pre-human and human evolution, were simply echoing the interpretations emanating from Europe with that continent's own discovery of Neandertals and Cro-Magnons. In fact, the initial discoveries of European Neandertals barely preceded the fossil man discoveries resulting from the mid 19th Century quarrying of gold in the California Sierra Nevada Foothills. The ensuing analysis, such as it was, of this possible evidence of a post-transitional or fully modern human presence in Tertiary deposit, was undertaken at the time by J.D. Whitney, State Surveyor for the California Geologic Survey Office and later, at the turn of the century, by William Henry Holmes. Perhaps these startling finds would have attracted more attention and study at the time had they been made by scientists rather than goldminers. An evaluation and appraisal of these finds, and the ensuing discussion and debate concerning their implications, is contained in a paper prepared for, and later refused by, *Current Anthropology* in 1990. The author, the late Professor Bruce E. Raemisch, believed that the modern human form evolved entirely in the Americas and that we have been relatively stable in our anatomy for millions of years. He was very clear about this while acknowledging that my own efforts would have to endure the disdain of the mainstream anthropological community. Although I am aiming to prove him right of his first contention his insights into the attitude the anthropological establishment would take have now been proven correct. By warning me of this hostility, to the ideas he had long advocated, he was preparing me for any shift in momentum the academic community might throw my way. Along the way I have continued to find willing participants, professionals and civilians alike, that have recognized the challenge to resolve inconsistencies that many have long perceived, but ignored.

One of the aims of his book is to solicit a renewed appraisal of the antiquity of the indigenous people of the Americas, by accepting the need to comprehend the limitations the present human origin theories contain and to identify resolutions to “missing links” this untested idea offers. A solution to the early man debate may be as

simple as 1) accepting a need to find tenable fossil evidence and 2) acknowledging that there are genetic, linguistic, and philosophical support that can be drawn in forming a new New World theory for human origins. That is the crux of the argument and I am not the first to identify it. There are however, more tools of the (anthropological) trade to discern that the truth can be defined, and that it lies within the Americas.

3/3 New World Paradigms and Paradigm Bias

In light of the implication of a “Paradigm bias” (Alsoszatai-Pethio 1986) that may or may not have (Meltzer 1991) afflicted the turn of the century American anthropological community, a reason and estimation defining the conventional wisdom of the time must have been aligned with the “given” that; Amerindians could not predate the initial presence of modern humans in Europe. This opinion, coincidentally, must have envisioned an initial Neandertal presence, and then, a recent arrival of modern types (*Homo sapiens*) to the Americas. An isolated Pleistocene New World Amerindian presence may ultimately find substantiation in the reevaluation of earlier paleontological, cultural, and archaeological remains that; “have the right to be accurately placed in the most factual context of a scientific framework giving them that identity and position which recognizes them for what they really may be (Raemsch 1990 unpublished paper pg. 13).” Although transitional fossils of ‘archaic’ modern humans (i.e. Neandertals or their apish kin) have not been found in the Americas, there has been little or no direct funding to support an alternate appraisal that would seek sanction of explanations of an isolated modern human presence in mid-Pleistocene America, (Abbott 1989; Ameghino 1915; Cook 1927), yet, contemporary with the Neandertal and other *Homo erectus* populations of Africa, Europe, and Asia. A fundamental problem in interpreting that humans were in the Americas during the Pleistocene (the last 3 million years) is confounded by traditional academic interpretations that assume that hominid evolution could not have been achieved of New World anthropoid derivation and that American Indians and all modern humans must be derived from Haplorrhines from the Old World.¹⁸

The preceding archaeological assessment is made in an effort to define exactly why we should — let me rephrase that, why we *must* — explore the New World for more definite signs of a human presence during (and before) the Pleistocene. In spite of all the

¹⁸ Evolutionary terms appear to separate the Western Hemisphere from the search for human origins because there are no known extant (living) apes in the Americas. I am not arguing that man originated in Australia, but rather against scientific research that would omit one set of continents because there are no living anthropoid apes and or fossil evidence equivalent to *Homo erectus*. The anatomically modern human fossil remains discovered in the Americas examined by Alfred R. Wallace and Julian Kollman in the 19th century need also to be dated - as well as other anomalous material - using present day technologies not available at the time of their discovery. The use of C-14 dating procedures as an 'absolute solution' for determining the potential age of these remains (Taylor R.E., Louis A. Payen, and Peter J. Slota, Jr., "The Age of the Caslaveras Skull: Dating the 'Piltdown Man' of the Americas," in *American Antiquity*, 1992 pp. 269-275) is constrained by possible recent contamination (Stafford, Thomas W., Jr., P.E. Hare, Lloyd Currie, A.J.T. Jill, and Douglas Donahue, Accuracy of North American Human Skeleton Ages in *Quaternary Research* 34, 111-120 1990). By determining what we should find in the Americas from Old World terms, some anthropologists have dismissed the evidence at hand as inconclusive. see Jelinek, Arthur J., "Perspectives From the Old World on the Habitation of the New," *American Antiquity* 57(2) 1992 pp. 345-347; Hrdlicka, Ales, and others, in *Early Man in South America*, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C. Bulletin 52. 1912; Hrdlicka, Ales, "The Origin and Antiquity of the American Indian." *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution for 1923, 1925*, pg. 481-94, Washington, D.C.

money that has already been spent searching the Eastern Hemisphere, we have still to find a descending line of Old World hominids that can be anatomically assured as directly evolving into modern humans. While the taxon 'hominid' essentially encompasses the transition to bipedal locomotion, there remains no restriction that would eliminate this potential evolutionary participation from New World platyrrhines. That we have not discovered or properly interpreted the existing fossil evidence (Abbott 1889; Cook 1927 and references there-in; Ameghino 1915; Bryan 1978; Raemsch 1990) of genuinely early modern humans in the Americas remains, of course, a valid criticism. To conclude that accidental finds should have already materialized in the Americas belies the implausibility of earlier unearthing of "Pleistocene" human remains that may have already been discovered in the Americas, yet, remain unsubstantiated because they run counter to prevailing theories and an *Asian origin* for Native Americans. The net result finds all early "early man" in the Americas (both 50,000+ or, as would be at least contemporaneous to *Homo erectus*; millions of years ago) still to be equivocally disproven. The dating of perhaps 40 early man specimens awaits their "approval and funding". In the end, theories to guide "results" remain suspect. For sure, I am not the first young scholar to take up the potential of true "Autochthonous" for Native American People. Clearly, great age to early "early man" finds from the Americas are supported by a growing number of genetic studies (Schurr et al. 1990; Ward et al. 1991; Chakraborty et al. 1991; Wallace and Torroni 1992). Archaeological assessments and discoveries (Dillehay 1989; Adovasio and Carlisle 1986; Guidon and Dilibries 1986; Cinq-Mars 1979; and others), should promote inquiries that could lead to an intensified interest in understanding the implications of preserved human fossil remains found during Goldmining activities more than a century ago.

3/3 The New World Fossil Record

3/1 This chapter will draw an overview from the many valuable fields directing anthropological research designs and endeavors and, by-so-doing, appeal to academic scholars to *take seriously this alternate appraisal* and willingly examine the potential anthropological support for pre-human primate origins from within the confines of the Western Hemisphere. Finding definitions in support of a New World primate origin for the American Indian and the first Old World *Homo sapiens* can be found in the "sudden replacement" of Old World hominid forms, specifically, *Homo erectus*. "Amerindians" are here-in proposed to be the antecedent for the initial presence of fully modern humans of the European Upper Paleolithic, the Asian Late Paleolithic, and the African Later Stone Age, populations representing a tangible alternative progenitor and the underlying cause for the "total replacement" of archaic Old World hominid forms.

This hypothesis will demonstrate that the New World offers a viable alternate higher primate source for human origins and that this proposition is both compatible and in harmony with basic scientific and evolutionary assessments drawn from the archaeological and paleontological record of both the Old and New Worlds. The present impasse and/or lack of resolution for modern human origins as interpreted from the specimens secured from the Old World fossil evidence is defined in the following quotes.

"One of the most hotly debated topics of research in the past decade has been that surrounding the first appearance in Western Eurasia of hominids that can be considered *anatomically and culturally modern*. Between 50,000 and 30,000 years ago, the Neanderthals and Mousterian [Middle Paleolithic] industries were *replaced*, from the Near East to the Atlantic seaboard, by physically modern humans whose culture showed significant innovations, many of them never seen before on earth. These included graphic representations, true blade technology, personal ornaments, complex weapon and propulsion systems, long distance procurement of a variety of durable raw materials, subsistence systems based on strategically organized use of the landscape over the course of the year, rapid and continual technological change through time, and cultural systems that vary greatly from region to region.

Although the Middle to Upper Paleolithic *transition* is viewed for purposes of this book as a Western Eurasian phenomenon, it is hard to deny its evolutionary import, especially when we see evidence for the above cultural changes as far afield as Australia." (*emphasis added*).¹⁹

The fossil record remains difficult to assess because we believe we are "somehow intimately linked with the first intercontinental [Old World] hominid, *Homo erectus*" as Howell 1984 posits;

"There is now a near consensus among students of human evolutionary biology that the origins of our own species, *Homo sapiens*, is somehow intimately linked with the first intercontinental ancient hominid, *Homo erectus*. However, neither the transformation of *erectus* to *sapiens* nor the transformation of ancient (archaic) populations of *Homo sapiens* to their anatomically modern successors (*H s sapiens*) are matters of agreement in this scientific fraternity. Undoubtedly, there are many factors that make this the case, and any reader of this volume will discern some of those that are most obvious. In fact, there is no consensus among the authors represented in this volume, although the major issues are generally well delineated, and *the limitations* of the diverse and often disparate lines of evidence *are usually apparent (emphasis added)*".²⁰

Hominid Replacement and the Old World Archaeological Record

Assigning 'sapient' behavior to *Homo erectus* activities is not a simple conclusion, but rather, an unsubstantiated perspective that is not demonstrated or verified within the Middle Paleolithic archaeological record supporting the presence of 'archaic' hominid forms. The indications are that the initial fully modern humans maintained vast cultural advantages including the ability to plan ahead and the proficiency to demonstrate - within the archaeological record - clear examples of reasoned adaptation to varying habitats and environments. In essence, archaeologists have in the Old World two distinct records of stone tool-making hominids: 1) the Acheulian, Mousterian or Middle Paleolithic industries as ascribed to *Homo erectus* of Africa and their migrational descendants of Europe and Asia; and 2) modern tool types specifically identifying *the Upper and Late*

¹⁹ [or the Americas] in *Before Lascaux: The complex Record of the Early Upper Paleolithic*, edited by Knecht, Heidi; Anne Pike-Tay; and Randall White, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1993 pg. 1.

²⁰ Howell, F. C., 1984, "Preface" to *The Origins of Modern Humans: A World Survey of the Fossil Evidence*. Eds. Smith FH, F. Spencer, New York: Alan R. Liss, Inc. 1984, p.xiii .

Paleolithic and Later Stone Age archaeological definitions attributed to the recent (< 45,000 ybp) arrival of *Homo sapien* populations of Europe, Asia, and Africa, *respectively*. That there are "problems" associated with the evolution of one set of tools into another (in European terms; the Middle/Upper Paleolithic transition or "Mousterian problem") is a perplexing issue, as difficult for many archaeological scholars to explain as the anatomical transition - from Neandertal man to Cro-Magnon man - (modern *Homo sapiens*).

Perhaps the most valuable perspectives to be gained from the ideas I am proposing are that modern humans were not the result of a recent Procrustean²¹ transition in anatomy and are not specifically related to the species, *Homo erectus*, found in association with the Middle Paleolithic African, European, or Asian fossil record. Several molecular anthropologists contend that *Homo erectus* of Africa and/or his migratory descendants in Europe and Asia did not all genetically contribute to the emergence of *Homo sapiens sapiens* (Stoneking et al. 1989). Although there are ongoing explanations for "Multiregional Evolution" where Asian, European, and African hominids each separately evolved into modern humans, there is growing archaeological and biological evidence indicating a "rapid replacement" by anatomically modern humans, and further, that our ancestors were themselves descendants of a separate progenitor population that may have been, most specifically, unrelated to *H. erectus*. What many molecular anthropologists and "Sudden Replacement" proponents (Stringer 1978) are asking us to presume is that our recent ancestors were waiting in one isolated location to re-populate the world as recently as 200,000-50 y.b.p., well after *Homo erectus* had previously colonized the entire Eastern Hemisphere, some 600,000 to 1,500,000 years earlier.

Paleontological confirmation of hominid evolution and evidence of a widespread dispersal of *Homo erectus* leads one to an obvious conclusion that the first hominid colonization of the Eastern Hemisphere was made by this distinct species. Yet, the transition of this unique species to fully modern humans or *Homo sapiens* continues to be debated within the fraternity of academic anthropologists committed to resolving this debate. We simply do not have a fundamental agreement that mankind evolved by way of "multiregional evolution" or for the source origin for the "rapid replacement" of these African hominids, be it out of Asia, Africa, Europe, or the Americas as I am proposing.

Archaeological and fossil evidence constitutes the basis of our evolutionary perspectives and offers proof of Old World hominid evolution and dispersal. But, is this 'hominid' the same ancestor that suddenly appears and replaces him, fully modern humans? Conclusive evidence is hard to find while many proponents favoring a specific source for this transition are lacking a definite consensus that would resolve this evolutionary dilemma. A growing number of investigators are finding that the evidence in the Old World does indicate that replacement of archaic hominid behavior and forms occurred suddenly both archaeologically and anatomically (Stringer 1989). Yet, a renewed counter attack championed by the extant advocates of "multiregional evolution" have left the evidence of a "single location" for the "source" of this "replacement" as less than equivocal.

In looking to the New World for the wellspring of humanity one must identify the potential for human/primate relationships. All higher primates are members

²¹ to produce conformity by violent or arbitrary means

of the same taxonomic group; Haplorhini, be they from the New World or what we call the Old. The propensity to include or exclude certain geographic areas from the search for ancestral human origins has centered on the homogeneous affinities that align us to living primate forms. Clearly, the only free living primate forms in Australia are humans and since we know of no fossil or extant primate forms in Australia, evolutionary theory leaves us little or no argument for supporting a human origin from this remote island continent. This line of inquiry would allow all primate homelands to be included in the search for human origins. Carrying this idea to its logical conclusion; could higher primate forms in the Americas be evaluated in a light that would ask - why the selectively advantageous terrestrial niche was not found by early New World primate forms?²²

Negative evidence and the Paleontological Record of the New and Old Worlds

Should the New World have given rise to hominids (and not just Africa) then theories would have to digest support for ancestral platyrrhine's initial propensity to secure a terrestrial adaptation. Will a concerted effort be made to fund such a search when fossil deposits are very difficult to find in Equatorial America (especially when compared to Old World sites like Olduvai or the Ethiopia Highlands)? As explained already, past efforts to fully evaluate the early "early man" finds of the Americas were not performed (or followed up) as they ran counter to mainstream evolutionary theory, theories promoted by the initial "traditionalists" including Ales Hrdlicka (1912). As a result, fossil discoveries of a fully modern human presence in the Americas have been left in limbo perhaps because they were found as the result of gold and silver mining activities and/or other dubious circumstances while paleontological digs by "professionals" including Argentina's Ameghino brothers were simply dismissed as anomalies. It is time to challenge the premise that the American Indians and later human descendants found leaving evidence of "cultured" behavior in the Upper and Late Paleolithic of the Old World could not have originated within the Americas because all fossil finds are of *Homo sapiens*.

The Old World evidence does support the presence of; 1) preserved hominid remains in Africa's Olduvai Gorge and the Ethiopian highlands that have aided the equation of research moneys that has helped provide paleontologists with the required assistance for searching for these early hominid forms; 2) theories resulting from these successful explorations that have defined are present knowledge of evolution and it's human terms; and 3) living anthropoid forms - especially apes - that have contributed to the scientific conviction that Africa and Asia remain the best or only locations for searching for the cradle of mankind. The (under-funded) fossil record of New World Primates has left paleontologists good reason to lament "the fragmentary record that must be used to decipher the evolution of this important group" while, "it can truly be said that the paleontological record of the New World platyrrhines is indeed the weakest of the lot. There are several reasons for this, but these mostly stem from the fact that, with the push to find human ancestors, emphasis has been outside of South America".²³

²² For example, fossil primate forms in Brazil have recently eluded that a Terrestrial primate larger than today's arboreal New World monkeys, lived in the Americas 14 million years ago (Heymann 1998).

²³ MacFadden Bruce, "Chronology of Cenozoic primate localities in South America," in *Journal of Human Evolution* Vol. 1990, 19 pg. 7.

Fossil finds from California's gold fields suggested an antiquity in the Americas that could span several geologic epochs. These fossil finds drew the attention of F. W. Putnam, John Wesley Powell, and J. D. Whitney who used them to argue that the anatomy of humans associated with these New World finds suggested a relative stability of the modern human anatomy. Other advocates of this interpretation included Alfred R. Wallace, Julian Kolman, and Sir Arthur Keith. Had the fossil discovery from the California gold fields of fully modern *Homo sapiens* been made in Europe they might have aroused a more thorough, scientific investigation. Perhaps J. D. Whitney, who is credited with the scientific interpretations concerning the geologic formations associated with these California finds, was right to argue that the contexts they were discovered in suggested that the human anatomy had remained relatively stable for well over 3 million years. His investigation into the nature and persons involved with these discoveries are outlined in "*The auriferous gravels of the Sierra Nevada of California*" published in 1879.

The late Bruce Raemsch, in an unpublished article, attempted to authenticate the historical accounts of some of these "early early man" discoveries. Here Raemsch identifies the circumstances relative to the witnesses Whitney used in identifying, what was to become the problematic Americanists position concerning, man's ancient occupation of the Americas.²⁴

'Writing about the find Whitney describes the event as follows:'

"The manner in which the skull in question came into the writer's possession is as follows: June 18, 1866, Dr. William Jones, of Murphy's, Calaveras County, a physician of extensive practice in that part of the mining region, and who has been long known to the writer, and for whose veracity and scientific tastes he can personally couch, wrote to the office of the Geological Survey, at San Francisco, stating that he had in his possession 'a human skull of Indian type, in a good state of preservation,' with the exception of the parietal and occipital portions, - the frontal, facial and temporal being complete, - which was recently found by Mssrs. Mattison & Co., in their claim on Bald Mountain, near Altaville and Angels one hundred and thirty feet from the surface and beneath the lava, in the cement and in close proximity to a completely petrified oak.

The State Geologist, (i.e. Whitney) being absent from the city at the time, Mr. Gabb, the Paleontologist of the Survey, answered Dr. Jones' letter, and requested that the skull might be sent to the office of the Survey for examination; which request was immediately complied with, and the skull forwarded on the 29th of June.

On his return to San Francisco, a few days later, the writer examined the skull, and at once proceeded to visit the locality. He saw Mr. Mattison, the principal owner of the claim from which the relic was taken, and heard from his own lips the same statement which Mr. Jones had communicated in his letter, with several additional items of information, some of the authenticity of the supposed find and here it may be remarked, that nothing is known unfavorable to the credibility of any of the witnesses to the facts in this case; and were it a question of only ordinary importance and interest, the statements made by them would have been received as being, without doubt, exact truth" (p. 267)."

"It might be important before proceeding, to explain Whitney's defense posture. Whitney takes great pains to vouch for the men involved in the finds, together with their descriptions under which the finds were made, because, before the writing of his accounts, the Calaveras skull had been presented to the scientific community at a meeting

²⁴ From an unpublished article given to the author by Bruce Raemsch (1902-1996) before his death.

of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and elsewhere, and because theologians on becoming aware of the possible significance of the find refused to accept any evidence of man on earth at any time, anywhere, before 4004 B.C., (a familiar bottleneck in studies of human antiquity). This rejection was true of many scientists of that day as well, but of course for different reasons. Whitney continues:

“The extreme care, however, with which all the facts in a case like this should be weighed, must be my excuse before these gentlemen for seeking to sift the evidence, and endeavoring to ascertain, by comparison and putting together of various circumstances, whether there were any flaws in the statements, or whether any reason could be found for doubting the exactness of the information given by them.

“Mr. Mattison, on being questioned, stated that he took the skull from his shaft in February, 1866, with some pieces of wood near it, and supposing it might be something of interest, carried it in a bag to the office of Wells, Fargo & Co.’s Express, at Angels, and gave it to Mr. Scribner, the agent, also well known to the writer as a man of intelligence and veracity. He stated, on being questioned in regard to the appearance of the skull when it was brought to him, that it was so embedded in and encrusted with earthy and stony material that he did not recognize what it was. Mr. Mattison had previously made a similar statement, saying that when he found the object he thought it to be a piece of the root of a tree, only a portion of the frontal bone being visible. Mt. Scribner’s clerk cleaned off a portion of the encrusting material, discovered that the article in question was a human skull, and, shortly after, gave it to Dr. Jones, who was well known in that region as an enthusiastic collector of objects of natural history, and in his possession it remained for some months before it was placed in the writer’s hands . . . (p. 268).”

The preceding narrative was taken from Raemsch’s 1990 research letter with his instruction that I “do something with it.” This work sites, by example, many of the early claims for great antiquity of man in the Americas. Also identified in Raemsch’s 1990 research letter is evidence of human footprints from Montana discovered by soldiers quelling a Sioux Indian uprising in the 1860s. The footprints are found in rock lying at an angle of about 30 degrees. The footprints are three-quarters of an inch deep and imply that the sand deposit that has since turned to stone has been uplifted and that this offers, in itself, indications of a human presence of great antiquity. A similar find was discovered in Nicaragua by Dr. Flint and sent to the Peabody Museum. Citing Putnam’s correspondence with Dr. Flint concerning the imprints of human feet in volcanic rock between 14 and 15 feet from the bottom of surface soil, Raemsch quotes the interpretations of this 1883 find:

“Since this report was put in type the blocks of rock containing the footprints have been received, and with them several small masses of the clay and tufa with the fossil leaves and grasses from the bed above the lava-rock containing the footprints. That the imprints were made by the feet of man, while the material of which the rock is formed was in a plastic condition, there is not the least doubt. The imprints are from 9 to 10 inches long, and about 4 wide across the ball of the foot, and all are highly arched. A paper cast taken of one of the imprints shows that it is a perfect impression of a naked foot, with heel, ball and toes perfectly distinct. The four imprints received are those of two, and possibly three individuals. Two are of right feet and two of left. One is much deeper than the others and was made while the material was in a different state of plasticity, as the impression has forced the substance outward so as to form a ridge about the imprint. Dr. Flint states that the stride was only from 11 to 18 inches, which indicates slow walking over the plastic substance. Of course only a careful geological study of the locality will furnish data as to the age of these remarkable impressions, but there can be

no doubt that they were made long before historical times” (Peabody Museum Reports 1885).

AUSTRALIA

Lahr, Marta M., and Wright, Richard V.S. **The question of robusticity and the relationship between cranial size and shape in *Homo sapiens***. *Journal of Human Evolution* (1996) **31**, 157-191.

It is suggested that the total morphological pattern observed in Australia does not reflect a plesio-morphic condition, but the specific history of occupation of that continent favouring size reduction with the maintenance of robusticity. p. 157

And last, these analyses show that Australian cranial morphology, at the centre of the debate about modern human origins, is indeed an outlier among modern anatomical patterns. However, the results also suggest that the Australian pattern does not result from the retention of a plesiomorphic combination of cranial dimensions and robusticity that would associate them to the Ngandong hominids. Although the cranial superstructures are in themselves plesiomorphous for all modern humans, the anatomical parameters that constrain their expression in Australian crania are a characteristic of this groups. The most likely explanation for their distinctiveness probably lies in the early occupation of Australia and subsequent differentiation within the continent. Wright (1976) suggested a similar evolutionary mechanism of local response to selection once in Australia to explain large dental size in the late Pleistocene Aboriginal population of this continent. p. 187

This distinctive pattern in Australia is not related to the retention of an ancestral condition because it is not found in conjectural ancestral forms, whether the early modern African/Middle Eastern samples or the Ngandong remains.

The correlation between robusticity and cranial dimensions highlights the need to study the cranial superstructures within the context of metrical variation, and not individually as evidence of phylogenetic relationships. p. 188

Part 4

3/4 Anomalous human definitions substantiating a contemporary Pleistocene occupation of the New World invite alternative evolutionary explanations including isolation from developing Old World lithic technologies. I propose that a primary component supporting the "Clovis First" model - that lithic tools similar to those defining the Northeast Asian Paleolithic must be found in mid-Pleistocene Amerindian definitions - should be dismissed as a criterion for authenticating Amerindian habitations anytime before the end of the last Ice Age. Binford uses the term Black Swans to explain that; what we become accustomed to seeing as universally acceptable to our way of thinking, can change when we discover a new way to look at it, as all swans are not white. What we have found at the banks of the Chichihuapi, changes for American Archaeology the color (character) of the “first” swans (initial behaviors) we have become accustomed to observing when identifying “Clovis First”. The evolutionary theory of an Asian progenitor we have long tested the initial peopling of the Americas with, no longer adequately explains the phenomenon that is so reliably defined in the well preserved archaeology left in the peat that is; Monte Verde.

The definitions from Monte Verde require that we compare, by reexamination, the limited evidence supporting other contemporary mid-Pleistocene sites. By this, it is implied that the behavior of the people living at Monte Verde might have gone unnoticed if they hadn't left their signature beneath a layer peat. What we are left with now, in accepting Pleistocene human occupation, is a new definition to guide our observation of what is a very limited lithic archaeological production when compared to contemporary Old World Pleistocene Upper or Late Paleo-LITHIC habitations. Certainly the sudden appearance of "White" Swans at the end of the last Ice Age is sustained in the evidence of Paleoindian Traditions and true hunter/gatherers cultures that must be related, and more specifically, descendant of Late Paleolithic People from northeast Asia. Evolutionary theory has ordained this as what we should expect in detailing the consensus paradigm affording the theory of Clovis First. However, since Clovis is no longer first we must now synthesize, as Fagan puts it, the "international significance" mid-Pleistocene occupation of the Americas of this nature portends.

In a letter to this author David Meltzer suggested that I might pay more attention to the Old World when applying New World concepts to evolutionary theory. As his letter indicates he is unaware of the problems and limitations that currently drive the engine of Old World evolutionary theory(s). These problems are discussed in the chapters highlighting the Old World continents. Suffice to say, Dr. Meltzer is an expert in New World archaeology and, as with most dedicated researchers, his expertise would be slighted were he to even entertain the notion that the holy grail of human origins has anything to do with Native Americans.

What we have separating the Upper Paleolithic from the Middle Paleolithic is a replacement of one species with another. The international significance of archaeological signatures defining mid-Pleistocene America and later Paleoindian Traditions require that we test these fundamental differences by encompassing evolutionary theory. If we are going to just dismiss preserved remnants of purportedly humanly created hearths in Pleistocene America then we should then ask why more of these formations are not found in Middle Paleolithic Europe. By comparison, if these New World hearths are the works of nature then nature should be providing us with the same evidence from Neandertal and Homo erectus occupations of the Old World. The fact is that hearths are not found in association with caves used by Neandertals because they did not control fire enough to know to line the fire with rocks. So, if I may wonder out-loud, why aren't there any caves with hearth-like foundations in pre-Upper Paleolithic Europe since, they seem to be acts of nature in the New World. Conversely, if the human palm and hand prints are intrusive along with the rest of the matrix forming New World mid-Pleistocene hearths, then why isn't this kind of intrusion characterized in the Middle Paleolithic? Certainly, the fraternity of Old World conservatives have argued for intrusion when articulating how, very occasionally, fragments of modern human bones end up in Middle Paleolithic levels, while progressive journals and imaginative biologists continue to portray these fragmentary pieces as the stuff to build theories from.

There must be a place in space and time, an explanation if you will, for the type of archaeological signatures coming from the New World Pleistocene record. But how long has this record been in place or would we believe in Monte Verde if it wasn't preserved in peat. Certainly, the lithics alone would not have been buoyant enough to wade the criticism that other less articulated mid-Pleistocene remains must continue to bear. What

Monte Verde provides is a comparison to test other less preserved evidence of Pliestocene occupation too. In an attempt to bring order in place and time to mid-Pleistocene American archaeology we must integrate evolutionary theory. My investigation into what researchers are finding in the Old World Middle Paleolithic and beyond suggests to me that it's evolutionary terms may be nothing more than a dead end, having nothing to do with modern human evolution - excepting for the possible contribution by *Homo erectus* to modern human developments in lithic tool production. Here the sharing of knowledge went both directions with modern humans employing stone more readily for tools and Neandertals learning to attach or heft stone tools onto spears or make handles for hand axes.

Mid-Pleistocene habitations from the Americas could provide a viable backdrop for later Upper Paleolithic habitation if we were to apply evolutionary theory to the behaviors sustaining archaeological production. What came first, Monte Verde's "learned economies" or Upper Paleolithic hunter/gatherers? Certainly it should not be supposed that Paleoindian Traditions developed from New World "learned economies" without a major influence from Paleolithic Asia and or Europe! Since archaeologists have come to see pre-Clovis habitation as real, shouldn't the task be to explain the infusion of specialized hunting traditions into preexisting Amerindian populations. Contrarily, shouldn't we find a new term for pre-Clovis since Clovis-like technologies were unknown to mid-Pleistocene Native Americans. Archaeological explanation favoring mid-Pleistocene habitations must rely on process of how the archaeological record come into being, just as the relationship to an Asian or European precursor was fundamental to the modeling of "Clovis First" theory. The archaeological society's community decision to sanction the existence of people in the Americas before 12,000 years ago is the first step in determine the significance such a presence offers the study of human pre-history.

During the last few years a great deal of progress has been made in identifying and responding to issues central to Native Americans concerns. The constructive steps taken to direct an integrated approach to Native issues and beliefs has led archaeologists to seek compatibility in furthering this commitment. A new era has peaked above the horizon, one that promises to herald progressive directives. One of these directives is in executing the daunting task of determining the significance a mid-Pleistocene human occupation of the Americas offers our knowledge of world prehistory. With this goes a willingness to advance indigenous persuasions including beliefs based on historic accounts of the past depicted in myth. Objectively must draw these beliefs into an order that can guide us in making accurate archaeological observations.

Comparisons can be drawn in discussing "Points of Order" against the backdrop of "oral traditions". Is it time to test of Native American origin myths to see if they are compatible with scientific terms and evolutionary theory? If the answer is yes then we must be willing to test Amerindian beliefs that would redirect the bearing of both recent and ancient human migrations. For example, the voluntary shifting of the Clovis First paradigm regarding the initial occupation of the Americas leaves scientists now with the obligation to test the likelihood of recent Native American contributions to the formation of Circumarctic Peoples.

In 1995 I presented a paper to the SAA suggesting that mitochondrial DNA analysis could promote an alternate persuasion, that a Holocene movement out of the Americas led to the present formation of the northernmost Native Americans. One month

following this presentation Steven Ousley published a paper in Human Biology addressing an analysis of recently discovered boxes of anthropometric data collected by Franz Boas at the turn-of-the-century. In his paper Ousley brought back to life Boas' "Eskimo wedge theory" a contention promoting two post-Ice Age American Indian migrations into the deglaciated north at the end of the last Ice Age. This persuasion casts new light on Eskimo and Athapaskan oral traditions; that their ancestors migrated "out of the Americas following the end of the last Ice Age." O'nieda, a tribal elder of the Bella Coola understood that their initial Amerindian occupation of this once glaciated region dated to a time when, and I quote him from Farrand in 1895, -- "in the beginning there was only ice and a narrow strip of shoreline." That these people could have come from the Americas at the end of the last Ice Age should be investigated anew, considering that there is now a general agreement that there were indeed people in the Americas during the Pliestocene.

Beringia Map with arrows

A Final Report was never published for the Jesup Expedition perhaps helping explain why Boas' theory seems to have been misplaced from the scope of later research. In fact, in a recent conversation (October 1999) with Theodore Schurr I was informed that researchers at Emory University's School of Medicine, (where many genetic papers concerning Native Americans emanate), were unaware of Boas' contention of "backmigration" by Amerindians at the end of the last ice Age. That Boas's and his colleagues work and conclusions on this issue remain virtually unknown to later researchers only epitomizes the problems we have inherited since he first addressed this indigenous account of their own beginnings. Boas is remembered as a great data collector but he was not someone who came to draw conclusions from his work. This may have been because he created so many waves in forwarding his, and his colleagues, believe that the people living in northeast Asia were similar to Native Americans, not because they were the ancestors of the first Americans but, because they were descendants of Native Americans who migrated north following deglaciation.

We might all agree that the formation of the present populations comprising deglaciated North America have rarely been tested against the backdrop of Boas' "Eskimo wedge theory." The implications of an "Eskimo wedge" provides an alternative to long standing theories that remain oblivious to alternative explanation. This untested direction favoring humans migrations across Beringia, be it by Land or by Sea, has yet to tread its own thin ice of scientific scrutiny although Boas has long ago tested these waters. Whether we chose to believe that people were in the Americas before the end of the last age - or not - subsequent Holocene migrations of Native Americans into Siberia could account for the multitude of similarities linking recently formed Circumarctic Peoples and Amerindians. As discussed earlier, the determination that some northeast Asians retain linguistic and genetic links with Native Americans does not confirm that they these similarities were not evidence of back migration. The predominant view discounting Boas's contention has clouded empirical wisdom since most researchers are either unaware of the alternative or are unwilling to address back-migration because it is the only way to properly interpret the accumulating data that suggests that Boas was correct.

overhead chart on mtDNA and Siberians Eskimos and Amerindians

Certainly the Clovis First hypothesis and the logic of the consensus view has identified the evidence of gene flow as an "Out of Asia" phenomenon. I would like to offer an archaeo-logical explanation for what Owen identified, in his Chapter "The Americas" in Smith/Spencer, 1984, " A World Survey of the Fossil Record" and others before and since, as ongoing problems in accepting a mid-Pleistocene human habitation of the Americas. There is little doubt that the removal of glacial barriers was key in bringing to the Americas Late Paleolithic technologies that later developed into Paleoindian Traditions. I am asking anthropologists to openly investigate the alternatives presented as an evolutionary alternative and to welcome the presentation of evidence that has yet to find the attention of the anthropological community at large. Science is founded in the relentless search for clearer knowledge. The picture is not more complicated if we are able to recreate the past by assimilating what might have happened from what we thought might have occurred. The movement of populations into and out of the Americas fits the data better than explanations suggesting one-directional movements, especially, at the end of the last Ice Age when we know both hemispheres held modern humans isolated by Glacial Ice.

A New Model of Prehistoric Behavior

Is there an autochthonous Amerindian correlate regarding the archaeological evidence of a modern human demic diffusion of advanced subsistence societies occurring earlier in the Old World? The New World mid-Pleistocene archaeological record offers an unexplored alternative for the evolutionary lifestyles that may have been ancestral to the formation of the Upper and Late Paleolithic, and/or Later Stone Ages defining the initial Old World modern human's archaeological record. Since many authorities have come to modify their earlier assessments by now accepting that "pre-Clovis" and/or "paleoarchaic" occupations exist, perhaps it is time to bring into play the proverbial sword of Alexander, releasing the knot that ties Gordius' chariot to the post. What is the significance of an Ice Age habitation of the Americas? My view is that an easier, more accommodating, paradigm awaits testing. Clearly, should acceptance of pre-Clovis dates become the consensus opinion (or an established fact, as it will ultimately become), a broader evaluation would be called for, and as well, welcomed (see Dillehay 1989; Orr and Berger 1966; Adovasio 1986, Cinq-Mars 1987; Guidon 1987; and others).

Do traditional methods "indicate a hidebound resistance to innovation?" This is an important perspective, one that could be seen to champion my own research strategies. As Harvard Universities' Stephen J. Gould assert's,

"Great intellectual revolutions are never simple infusions of knowledge into a previous void; they are always exercises in destruction and replacement." The sincerity of my own efforts have been built upon the fruitful work of others by acknowledging past traditions with the understanding that, "the most historically potent and positive form of creativity must occupy the middle ground between strong respect for accepted norms and accumulated knowledge" (Gould 3/1992 pgs. 4 - 11).

Differing opinions and a lack of consensus define the arguments empowering the two main camps defining modern human evolutionary theory; "multi-regional evolution" and "rapid replacement." Alternatively, hypotheses concerning the initial presence of *Homo sapiens* in the Western Hemisphere are chiefly defined as the result of migrations from Asia. These theories are often based on linguistic, genetic, dental, archaeological, or ethno-historical surveys, being cast from the nineteenth century contention that modern man could not predate the Neandertals (Greenberg, Turner, and Zegura 1986). The fact remains that all fossil man finds in the Americas are of anatomically modern humans, yet few of these potentially ancient specimens have been dated (see Raemsch 1990). Since modern man is known to have replaced the previous archaic forms known to have existed in Europe in earlier times, the consensus has followed that anatomically modern man in the Americas could not predate the European evidence of, the Neandertals. The alternative could be; there were *Homo sapiens* in the Americas before they arrived in Europe as dates from sites like Pedra Ferada, Pendejo Cave, and Santa Rosa Island suggest (Guidon 1986; MacNeish 1993; and Orr and Berger 1966)?

Anthropological studies implying human evolutionary hypotheses have rarely promoted inquiries into an autochthonous origin of man in the Americas, those tendered concerns central to turn of the century convictions of Chamberlain, Ameghino, Wallace, Sidis and others. Clearly, the initial presence of man in the Americas remains unresolved while many anthropologists and archaeologists point to the Old World to define the "unsubstantiated" perspectives held by advocates of a "pre-Clovis" or "paleoarchaic presence" of man in the Americas (Jelinek 1992). Moreover, these paleoarchaic or pre-Clovis sites are seen as "Archaeo-Logically" unreasonable (Dincauze 1984). Alternatively, should the dating of humans in the Americas in mid-Pleistocene times be accurate (or greater than 33,000; or 47,000 y.b.p.), then a new paradigm to guide this observation is called for.

A developed theory supporting pre-Clovis habitation could ally itself with the conservative analysis from the old World. This analysis could find warranting validation of a New World paleoarchaic origin by, in-itself, challenging today's "conventional wisdom," assigned to liberal definitions purporting an Old World decent of man, be it out of Africa or Asia. A new "warranted" perspective must follow the prospect of determining what should or shouldn't be found in the earliest New World archaeological record (Swanson 1959). The corollary linking Amerindian mid-Pleistocene subsistence behaviors with the problems many anthropologists have in accepting them could be flawed in the valid interpretation of an Old World origin for well-developed stone tool industries, be they made by Neandertals during the Middle Paleolithic or Cro-Magnon Man marking the onset of *Homo sapiens* and the Upper Paleolithic.

Despite sometimes argumentative correspondence between Ameghino and Hrdlicka (and others), an evolutionary exclusion of the ancestral capacities of the American Indian was established, following Ameghino's death in 1911. Moreover, the abandonment of the autochthonous origin hypothesis and an in-situ origin of the American Indian was made long before the acceptance of "Folsom" or "Clovis man" in the northern Americas in 1935. Perhaps today's philosophical anthropological observations should bring into question the foreordained hypothesis that there was an Old World source for our own kind. It remains a certainty for many researchers that, American Indians could not have been present in the Americas when Neandertals were

roaming Europe (Fagan 1990). Unfortunately, a CONTROVERSY exists today with regard to the prospect of accepting the Amerindian's paleoarchaic period, an Ice Age presence of mankind in the Americas, and/or the implications such a presence offers for the origins of *Homo sapiens*, who, only recently, colonized the Old World.

When “Paleoarchaic” habitations gain acceptance, a compatible rethinking of evolutionary terms and research strategies must follow. The fact is, there remains a persistent problem in finding a common consensus be it about the first peopling of the Americas or the first modern peopling of the Old World (Owen 1984; Howell 1984). I am attempting to promote an inquiry into an old theory through the incorporation of an interdisciplinary inter-hemispherical approach to the study of the evolutionary history of the Higher Primate family. Speculation and the philosophical capacity to predetermine that the American Indian should not, or could not, or will not be included in the search for modern human origins is at issue. This argument carries with it the prospect that *Homo sapiens* have been anatomically modern long before their arrival into the Old World.

3/4 Treading on Thin Ice

If I were arguing the anthropological equivalent of an “earth is flat” theory (that the American Indian did not walk in from Asia),¹² then the reasoning behind my hypothetical concerns should be able to measure itself against the scientific consensus that would prove otherwise. The following quotes identify the forgone conclusion investigations of the “first Americans” start with when by identifying an Asian origin:

Traditional Anthropological analysis has confirmed that American Indians came from Asia, probably crossing the Bering land bridge when it was exposed during an episode of glaciation (Crawford and Enciso 1983; Fladmark 1983; Laughlin and Wolf 1979; Matson et al. 1968; Schell and Blumberg 1988; Turner 1983, 1987; Williams 1985).²⁵

There is no argument among *serious researchers* that a mongoloid stock first colonized the New World from northern Asia. Nor is there controversy about the fact that these continental pioneers used the exposed Bering Land bridge that then connected the Asian Far East with Alaska (Laughlin and Harper 1979; Szathmary 1985). However there are still questions concerning the number of migrations into the New World, when they may have occurred, their composition, and the ultimate fate of these early Americans (Owen 1984; Irving 1985; Greenberg et al. 1986; Szathmary in press).²⁶

With rare exceptions, no general anthropological formulations attempt to weave the phenomena presented as evidence to the Pre-Clovis contention into the generally acknowledged fabric of world prehistory.²⁷

Although it has been rarely argued that the American Indian was truly indigenous to the Americas, the idea has been championed by Las Casas (1521; 1909); Whitney (1879); Holmes (1899); Chamberlain (1912); Ameghino (1893, 1911, 1915); Lummis

²⁵ from Wallace et al. 1992 pg.404, *emphasis mine*

²⁶ Shields et al. 1992 pg. 759, *emphasis mine*

²⁷ Owen 1984 p. 520

(1925);²⁸ and others including most recently, Raemsch (1990, unpublished) and Dzielbel (1999). An American genesis may offer solutions in contrast to present ambiguities contained in “missing links” defining the Old World fossil and archaeological record.

A resolution is offered to both the early man debate and the continuing genetic assessment surrounding the indigenous character of Amerindians. The validation of proof must be examined in both method and theory while objectivity must endorse a willingness to examine alternate perspectives that would support the presence of a new kind of archaeological evidence. My own research began by accepting that there remains a persistent Old World anthropological debate, unable to link us with *Homo erectus*. The reliance on a transitional element or “punctuated evolution” for evidence supporting the causation of our sudden humanness truly cannot be conveniently resolved from the archaeological or fossil evidence emanating from the African, Asian and European paleontological record (Tattersal 1992; Howell 1984). The existence of an ongoing debate (with no resolution in sight) between Multi-Regional and Sudden Replacement proponents indicates that the Old World may *not* have harbored the “cradle of mankind.” The present impasse affirms that, until the “taboo” is removed, and we willing examine the Americas as a source for the human Wellspring, anthropologists will continue this debate.

²⁸ Casas, Bartolomé De Las 1909. *Apologética Historia de las Indias*, in M. Serrano y Sanz, ed. Madrid: Bailliere. Whitney, Josiah D., *The Auriferous Gravels Of the Sierra Nevada of California*, Memoirs of the Museum of Comparative Zoology. Harvard College 1879, Vol. VI, No. 1 (1st. Part); Holmes, William Henry, "Auriferous Gravel Man," *American Anthropologist*, 1899, N.S. 1: 641-5; Ameghino, Florentino 1893, New Discoveries of Fossil Mammalia of southern Patagonia. *American Naturalist*.; 1911, "Une Noubelle Industrie Lithique." *Anales del Museo Nacional de Buenos Aires*, vol. 13, ser. 3, 189-204. Buenos Aires.; 1915. *La Antigüedad de los Hombres en El Plata, Obras Completas Correspondencia de Florentino Amighino*, vol. 3. La Plata.; Lummis, Charles F. 1925. *Mesa Canon and Pueblo*. The Century Co., New York and London;