

## ARCHAEOLOGY

We too often conclude that early man's accomplishments are limited to what the archaeologists have uncovered. From this we develop the concept that our ancestors truly were stupid and primitive! We must realize that what archaeology finds was not altogether what those people were using: What we find are TOOLS! Even today man needs a myriad of tools for everything that is manufactured. Man has always needed tools. In many cases, then, what archaeology is actually turning up are those items which have survived the longest—that is, just the TOOL KIT!

It's like going out into the barn, the workshop or the garage. The tool kit of most men even in our modern day, aesthetically and culturally, looks very primitive compared to what he might have in his home. It's one thing to have a hammer, a saw, a chisel; it's another thing altogether to see what those tools produce! But that finished product would probably be in the form of wood which does not survive the ravages of time. It's one thing to see a scraper or various/that might be used for the preparation of food—or, in this case, skins, which would be a very important beginning item in the development of culture. It's another thing to see the end product! The means of working it has survived; the end product has not (unless it be something like a carving).

### Man's Primary Purpose on Earth

So we are confronted with the question, then, of what kinds of discoveries man might have made and what man's purpose was. A special point to be borne in mind is that the primary purpose man is on earth is not to make tools or to make things with tools but to develop his character. The point is that it is not possible to discover this primary purpose for which man is here through archaeology. We can only understand in a secondary way whether he did develop character by whether or not he was making spears, guns or items of this nature! (Recall the example of Tubalcain in Genesis 4.) So the real purpose for which man is here is not directly discerned from material remains because it does not leave an archaeological entity which may be uncovered!

### Key Factors in Cultural Development

Let's think of a list of important items in the history of cultural development. For example, man had to learn how to make bread, he would have to learn how to develop yeast for bread making in order to go beyond just unleavened bread. He would have to learn how to make butter. The concept of making wine would also be important. He would have to learn how to raise the temperature of a fire for the purpose of smelting metal—and to originally even conceive of the possibility that metal is even worth smelting. He had to learn how to develop certain strains of grains, vegetables and cattle for maximum human use. Later on he would discover the making of pottery; and how to make baskets so that they will stay together and not come apart. There are many primary discoveries that we should consider that would leave no archaeological remains! Another important example is the development of cloth or fabric as a result of growing hemp, cotton or flax. All of these are BASIC DISCOVERIES—basic ones! If we would take away the industrial discoveries of the modern/<sup>man</sup>we would wonder how man survived for the first 5,000 years. The answer is that man has always had these primary cultural concepts. Undoubtedly, in the first few centuries of man's earthly existence many of these basic concepts needed to fill the rudimentary needs of man were made leaving no archaeological remains to any great extent.

Early Man and Crops

(105) The Biblical record clearly shows man as, first of all, a shepherd—that is, a moving, nomadic sort of human being. And if he grows grain, clearly, as I have explained before, he does not have to remain at the site of the grain; he only plants it, he doesn't have to hoe it, but he comes back to reap it.

Now, we have learned some things as well about the Garden of Eden and the material God gave man to work with. It is very possible that the implication of "have dominion over the fish of the sea, the fowls of the air, the beasts of the field, and over all of the earth"—this may well imply that much of what man first of all had to work with was the kind of plant that grows naturally in nature. I brought up the question of how much stock—how many plants and vegetables—would have grown as they are and how much would have needed cultivation by man. In other words, cabbage, broccoli, kale, cauliflower, brussel sprouts—you know, this type of plant—have all been gradually developed from either what we might call a kind of wild kale or wild cabbage in NW Europe, or unusual varieties that might show up in nature.

Now it appears, in the long run, that when God gives man a job to do, that he gives man the man the brains to be able to think it through and then the time to work at it, but it isn't all perfected. I perceive, in part, that it is very possible that the Garden of Eden may have had many of the primary grains and roots and vegetables that man would have been cultivating later if they had obeyed God; and I rather suspect that outside of the Garden of Eden there mostly existed what we would call ordinary wild grasses and vegetables and animals (although they didn't have the fear of man on them then) that would need cultivation.

(106) What I'm getting to is that it is very possible—and we would have archaeology as a kind of guide—it is very possible that the kind of plants and animals that man had to first work with once he was kicked out of the Garden of Eden is the kind that he would have to learn to cultivate, to learn to domesticate, and to put to use; and to develop what we would call selective breeding of the best stock which he would, in turn, have to cultivate himself. In other words, the wild cabbage grows by itself but if you plant the vegetable seeds that give the plants that we now put on the market and they need cultivation or they would be choked out by the wild plants. This is merely to show that man was meant to cultivate and to develop it. But these mutations, these varieties—whatever you want to call them—do occur in nature.

(150) And I suspect that in many cases, the animals that were available would be similar to what we would call—let's take the highland cattle of Scotland as an example—just native to the area, wild in the area, that are susceptible to domestication. There are some wild animals that are not susceptible to domestication. There are some domestic animals that differ completely from the wild forms because they have bred up to have, for example, short legs—there are certain short-legged sheep that do not ordinarily survive in nature but do occur in nature and they have been cultivated by man for certain purposes. Man therefore assumes—the archaeologist assumes—that if the sheep bone in times past was not like the modern sheep that the first humans were using some kind of wild sheep and therefore he must have been hunting them!

(160) The concept that because there might be a bone structure in animals, or grains that are common to nature, grains that are not mutations, grains that will shatter when struck in harvesting—that because man may have indeed first learned to work with them, and then from them develop other strains, that therefore he must have been a wild, primitive, hunting savage! This is the conclusion that is drawn.

Early Man NOT a Savage Hunter

(105) Now I would draw the conclusion, after considering the whole thing, that if man was meant to have dominion—and God said that's what his role on earth was (Gen. 1:26,28)—man was also meant to work at it! And therefore man was meant to develop it. Thus, we might well expect that the varieties which have been produced, and that are now on the market, were not always there immediately for man's convenient use. They may well have been available in nature—man was meant to discover them in nature—they might have been, in fact, planted in the Garden of Eden but man was kicked out. And therefore man had to recover—discover—and to work at the development of them in a world in which there now were thorns and thistles, sweat and toil!

(170) The Biblical record certainly makes clear that the earliest humans practiced agriculture to start with, not hunting! But the archaeologist conceives of hunting as the idea by which he interprets the tool kit of first man.

The Implications of Genesis 3:21

When God sent Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden, He clothed them with skins. After all, man couldn't learn right away to weave cloth. Today we take cloth for granted, but think about it—it is much easier to make a dress out of pieces of cloth than to first weave the cloth itself!

In this original instance, then, God made clothes out of skin. The point is that man followed this practice for centuries afterward! And, obviously, God must also have set the example of butchering an animal and preparing its flesh for food for man because man had not been told anything about animal flesh prior to this time..

The scripture clearly implies that man had to be taught the primary things! He had to be told what to eat. And the Bible account clearly implies that God showed man how to prepare a fire (He was sending him out, you remember, in the cool of the day, in the evening—Gen. 3:8,21) and how to roast that meal—as well as clothing him!

And to butcher the animal presumes that God must have used some kind of instrument. He must have taken up some instrument and killed that animal—He didn't just miraculously create coats of skin. (The implication is that the animal's blood was shed as a type in itself.) The God of Creation showed man how to make some kind of instrument to cut that animal's throat and then to skin the animal. Thus God must have been showing the first man how to make tools of whatever is immediately handy just as a starting idea. I think this is the conclusion we would have to come to in analyzing the picture in Genesis 3 concerning the events relating to the expulsion from the Garden.

Man Not an Agriculturalist Till the Mesolithic?

It has been assumed all along that not until the Mesolithic did man become agricultural: 1) because evolution tells us that man started out as a primitive, stupid hunter; 2) because not until this period do archaeologists find varieties that today are recognized as wholly domestic forms! But was man, suddenly, at a certain moment, discovering all of this while knowing nothing of it before? Well the answer clearly is that the reason the Mesolithic shows all these varieties is that man must <sup>have</sup> been by this time beginning to select them. When we come to the Mesolithic we find both the so-called wild and the more domestic varieties. And even in the Upper Paleolithic you discover the beginning of domestic sheep and goats. The presence of dogs is also common in the Paleolithic—which obviously were necessary for the keeping of stock.

Reinterpreting the Tool Kit

Now let's look at some statements in Palestine Before the Hebrews by Anati. Page 63 first: "When we observe the Tabunian material culture"—this is Lower Paleolithic—"it is hard indeed to recognize in it any tool that could be used efficiently for hunting. In the Near East, the animal bones found in the layers of this culture usually are extremely scanty." In other words, if we really look at it, <sup>in</sup> the first 300,000 years of human life—if we accept their evolutionary time-table—man certainly was not a hunter!!

The first tool kit is not indicative of man as a hunter! It is not indicative of man as a hunter! It is not indicative of man either as a primary meat-eater.

What kind of tools? "Flake tools" were used (page 65) which "included mainly side-scrapers"—these are terms they use—"or large flakes retouched along one or two sides, and toothed and notched flakes." Now you don't hunt, you don't spear, deer with toothed and notched flakes. You don't pursue wild goats with side-scrapers! Some might—but it is not the logical thing!

In other words, what we are plainly dealing with are varieties of animals that yet needed the domestic touch and selective breeding which man himself was already apparently—from this description and from the Biblical description—learning to subdue and learning to domesticate.

Side-scrapers, retouched flakes, and toothed and notched flakes certainly indicate some means of sawing, some means of cutting—or even of reaping. You have to use this type of equipment, in other words, for what we would call agricultural purposes but which the prehistorians call "food gatherers and food collectors." The assumption is that man was not an agriculturalist and this is their way to indicate man was not yet, let's say, learning to farm; therefore they use the expression "food gathering and food collecting" to imply that he was just a primitive sort of person who was struck by wild berries and saw they tasted good and proceeded to gather them. He wasn't even thinking agriculturally, in other words—he was only trying to consume!

Well, the answer to the question is that what they call this primitive type of equipment was obviously what man was first using when he started out—he had to learn to flake. I challenge any of you to prepare some kind arrow or flake from flint without breaking it—not after the first time but after the first hundred times! It takes a technique of knowing how to put pressure on certain kinds of otherwise very brittle material that is even sharper than steel (if you don't break it).

Notice page 66: This equipment "might have served to open nuts and to cut roots and tubers, as well as for defense and for hunting." Now this is speaking of the later use of the hand-axe. Actually the implication of hunting is very limited. "It is not unlikely that some of them were used as missiles against game. This possibility is suggested by a type of disk-shaped biface excellently balanced for hurling at nearby targets. Experiments in throwing these disks have shown that they can be effective weapons at up to sixty or seventy yards, but we shall probably never know in exactly what manner these tools were handled and used by their makers." Now we do not say that man may not have hunted at all. After all, Mr. Ted Armstrong does and he lives in the space age! We are merely showing that the primary tool kit to begin with was never hunting, and only later do you have the beginning of instruments that might be heaved as far as around 200 feet. But they have found that the only known missiles were burnt pieces of yew wood that in some case were found in the ribs of an elephant at an extremely early geological horizon, <sup>and</sup> the tip was hardened in fire. But certainly, contrary to the concept of "hunters and gatherers," the emphasis in earliest times was not on hunting.

Now move to another quote on page 117: "The principal flint tools of the Upper Paleolithic are pointed blades with a blunt side; end-scrapers, or blades having a terminal and usually rounded retouching; and burins, chisel-like tools made by delicately trimming the point of the artifact on the thin edge of the flake....We have only a very vague idea of the use of all the many varieties of 'scrapers.' They must have been tools of daily use, and among other things might have served for scraping and cleaning animal skins, for cutting hair, for stripping bark from wood, and for other similar work." Obviously somebody was shaving, somebody was cutting hair, somebody was cleaning animal skins and cutting them. Continuing: "The chisel-like burin is well adapted for fine work on wood, antler, bone, and soft stones. Some artifacts look like borers, drills, and other instruments which might have been used for various work on skins, wood, and other raw materials."

So their sole concept is that early man was a hunter, therefore all the artifacts must be interpreted in this context. But it doesn't matter what man was—all of these materials were capable of being used by the earliest generations of men whether or not they were hunters. In fact, the whole implication is that most of this equipment was not for the purpose of pursuing and killing the animal, but for the purpose of dressing the animal and preparing food and other items of a household nature. This is what is implied by this description in Anati as to the nature of the early tool kit.

All of this goes to indicate clearly that man was still finding the need of clothing a primary factor—hence the need for animals, the need even for bark. There are tribes even today that still use bark, and some trees were made to have bark that can be used for clothing! There are whole tribes in Africa that use bark for clothing. And, you know, you have matting as well; and you have skins for tents. Certainly animal skins must have been a primary need in the earliest days of human history before man learned to weave cloth.

By no means, then, does any of this archaeological material mean that before we get to the Mesolithic man was strictly a hunter and not an agriculturalist in any sense. It means that man was making his primary discoveries during the period of sparse but rising population that led to the Mesolithic at which point we have the full development of food production and animal domestication where archaeologists and prehistorians would no longer call these factors into question. In other words man is learning, within the first few centuries—probably by 400 A.M. he had already reached the Mesolithic stage of cultural development (earlier Dr. Hoeh has used the date 400 A.M. as possibly being the end of the Mesolithic), and he had already progressed with all the basic developments during that time that have been mentioned above.

#### Oldest Paleolithic Surface Find

Now one last quote from another book. This is from The World History of the Jewish People, vol. I by Speiser entitled "At the Dawn of Civilization," page 67: "The oldest surface finds from Lower Paleolithic"—and the oldest surface finds anywhere really come from the Middle East—but "the oldest surface finds from Lower Paleolithic come from the hill-country around Jerusalem. In the enclosed depression of the Biq'a, southwest of Jerusalem, R. Neuville and M. Stekelis made soundings in 1932 which established a stratigraphic sequence of 'Chellean' and 'Lower Acheulian' hand-axes."

What they are saying is that, as far as man knows today, the oldest find—other than Leakey (and I think not only do his finds need examination, but he does!)—the oldest surface finds from Lower Paleolithic come from the hill-country around Jerusalem!

This is very significant when we stop to consider that man should have originally arisen in this very area! This certainly implies a totally new view. It completes what

we have discussed before with respect to the sequence of human culture—it puts them in the right light where we are dealing with clearly primitive, but nevertheless domestic tools and not some hunter's kit. And the manner in which this culture was spread would imply that man was migrating and leaving these remains wherever he moved.

#### All Early Groups Participated in the Same Culture

Another important point: Always, the earliest remains in Palestine are associated with multi-racial groups. And only when you come to the Mousterian in northwestern Europe do you have a people who had a culture level—when they were driven out of Palestine, go into northwestern Europe....but when these people were in the Middle East, all racial types partake of the Mousterian culture. In Europe they do not—because the Nephilim must have been driven out from Palestine at a time when this was the cultural level of man as a whole; and in northwestern Europe they didn't progress beyond it before they were almost completely slain and wiped out by a people coming into Europe who had a modern type of skeletal pattern. These smaller but more highly skilled people destroyed them and brought in a new cultural pattern on top of the Mousterian.

But the indication is that all these earliest cultural levels were participated in by most men—and starting out essentially always in the Middle East where you have the earliest Mesolithic, the earliest Paleolithic (and, in that sense, the earliest Lower Paleolithic as well as we have just quoted from page 67 of Speiser).

This completes our discussion of archaeology for today.