

Keeping Abreast in Archaeology! (Endnote 17, Chapter 1, *Swords at Sunset*)

For some years, about ten to fifteen, I've gradually developed the notion through observation that women's breasts are some kind of "emotional or social sensory organs".

As many readers know, I have a fair amount of zoological and anthropological training (under Dr. Carlton Coon, among others). It would make sense, around a tribal fire, for women's breasts to be able to "pick up" and transmit the "social vibes" of the group, especially of possibly aggressive males (and females) in the group. I have even conducted some "semi-scientific" research on this idea using Duke University's card system.

A topless woman seeing a card and then "sending the image" to another topless woman who "receives" the symbol mentally, results in scores higher than chance. And I've tried all combinations of topless sender, topless receiver, various symbols and more complex messages.

The size of the breast doesn't seem to matter so much (although bigger breasts seem to "receive" a bit better), but what really *does* matter seems to be the nipple. Big nipples with a definite teat work better than "little girl"-type nipples. Redheads (with redder nipples) seem to work better than other skin complexions.

I think this may be the source of "women's intuition" and maybe also the origin of some Wiccan lore. And maybe this is why so many "seers" (or "witches", if you prefer) have been women.

This has also helped me to find artifacts because some of my women friends could walk over terrain and tell me where they felt "emotional vibes" -- a battle, or much sadness or misery. And where any human tragedy happens, you're likely to find either a collection of artifacts...or lawyers.

The woman doesn't have to be completely topless, but the breasts can only be covered by a *thin layer* of non-synthetic material. But you do get more definite "vibes" with bare breasts.

In 1995, before I met Joëlle in 1997, I went to the Escarpment with a tall (taller than me), biggish-breasted redheaded woman named Zoë, the wife of a good friend of mine, Bob, a special effects artist in the film business. Bob had been working on a film shoot for six solid weeks, night and day, and Zoë was bored stiff and had hardly seen him. So I invited her for a day trip on the Escarpment to give her something to do. This area had always intrigued me because it just looked "lived in" by Europeans for a long time.

It was at the Welland Feeder Canal that Zoë got such strong vibes of sadness that she began to cry. I told her then what I suspected (*Swords at Sunset*) about the area. And I also told her what I suspected about breasts and why, perhaps, she had started crying. Being an uninhibited and somewhat bohemian girl, Zoë took off her bra and held her T-shirt clear of her nipples and walked all around this part of the canal banks. She pinpointed a "grave" and I dug. I did not find a burial, but I found a half-dozen arrowheads around a rusted iron "battle-axe" blade. Several of

these “battle-axe-looking” blades have been found in the Escarpment area, the last about 15 years ago in Stony Creek. You read about these discoveries every few years or so.

Since the experience with Zoë, I've usually taken a woman along to Escarpment areas, and preferably a woman who was somewhat "exhibitionist" (that's a man's term).

I think women were and are designed to go topless because they get valuable information that way, and "clothing them decently" according to Judaic-based religions is a purposeful attempt to blunt their sensory input, their birthright.

Now, researching with Joëlle on the Escarpment, there was seldom any problem (in the summer, that is) because of her topless proclivities. And I think that's one of the reasons we found so many artifacts of the Grail-related sort. I knew where to go, generally, by the "lay of the land" and the history I had worked out, and Joëlle could then pinpoint where to dig. Now, she may have been correct 100% of the time for all I know, but we found some anomalous “European” artifact about 30%-50% of the time. This is better, much better, than the usual archaeological dig. This is why I also wanted to include a semi-nude photo of Joëlle in Chapter 1 of *Swords at Sunset*. Besides “titillation” (pun intended) her proclivities contributed materially to our success!

I think that a book about finding old artifacts, combined with tasteful photos of topless researchers and Wiccan commentary, would probably be a bestseller in itself. Aside from that, some very valuable additional evidence of pre-colonial Europeans on the Escarpment might be found.

Now the "Cooley" site at Ancaster, Ontario (near Hamilton) was a known early and small colonial cemetery where archaeologists expected to find 6-12 interments. Instead, over 100 were found. The archaeologists have clammed up, but it is possible that some of the "extra" bodies may have been pre-colonial Europeans. Early colonial settlers may have accidentally discovered this cemetery and then have used it themselves.

About 20-30 years ago, it seems to me, Elaine Morgan wrote a book called *The Descent of Woman*. She basically took Sir Alastair Hardy's Oxford theory of human evolution and applied it to the evolution of women only. It was very popular in some feminist and New Age circles, but physical anthropologists (both male and female) were either amused or outraged by it.

Although it is simply a fact that only human females among the primates (or *any* mammals) have breasts that protrude all year around and not just when nursing, Elaine Morgan denied this. She didn't like the current anthropological explanation that human female breasts had developed as "sexual aggression-displacement mechanisms" in addition, of course, as a means of nurturing babies. Morgan went on to assert that manatees also had human-like breasts. They do not.

Morgan would have been better off to have met me and talked with me. Although human female breasts are undoubtedly *both* "sexual aggression-displacement mechanisms" *and* "secondary sexual attractants" (and mammary glands), I think they are *also* and perhaps more significantly for human evolution some sort of "emotional and social sensory organs".

I find it odd that human female breasts must have developed rather suddenly, and then in response to a fairly large leap in intelligence that characterized the transition between Australopithecines (thought to be like Chimpanzees – no breasts) and true "humans", although very primitive humans.

I call these "not quite human" or "very primitive human" creatures "Australo-homo-pithecines" and there were apparently many different kinds of them. On some, like the *Sedepa* described from Sumatra, the females are reported to have small but definite breasts. And this *Sedepa* is only on the very barest threshold of being fully "human".

All "modern humans" known to be living today, even groups so primitive as the Ulele pygmies of the Congo and the *hantu Sakai* of former Malaysia, have definite female breasts. They also all have at least a rudimentary form of *religion*.

To me, there's nothing remotely "mystical" or "spiritual" about religion. Religion has a biological and evolutionary function. It is to assert the conception of "territory in the dimension of time" as a valid human environment to be inhabited and "exploited", but this all-important concept is really what separates us from other "animals".

Human breasts seem to have developed in step with the conception of religion. This is because of the higher level of aggression required of humans by yet *another* kind of "territory" (in addition to real territory and the social territory of dominance) to be inhabited, defended and asserted. Females, women, above all had to be able to assess the stage of this higher level of aggression at any given time and to decide whether it posed an immediate threat to themselves and their children.

I have some reproducible evidence for this opinion. I would like to explore this possibility, get more indisputable evidence of it, and do a book about it. I would suggest reading *Esau's Empire II* on my website, "The Psychobiology of Religion". It is basically the gist of my first book, *The Cronos Complex*. This book earned me several Nobel Prize nominations and may well win it some day.

In terms of archaeology, even the State Archaeologist of Massachusetts advises "dowsing" when all else fails (*The Amateur Archaeologist's Handbook*). He then gives helpful directions for making hazel-wood "dowsing rods". For those who may be outraged at bare-breasted archaeology, maybe "breast dowsing" is a more palatable term.

Research associates in this work are always needed and always appreciated. Gee, this research is one of those projects requiring long-term and painstaking observation. It is a difficult job but someone has to do it!