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Abstract

Piltdown Man is the most notorious case of scientific forgery in the history of British archaeology and palaeoanthropology. Although the period from its introduction in 1912 until the exposure of the forgery in 1953 has been well-studied, the literature written after 1953 has received no such treatment. It is the purpose of this bibliography to place this growing body of literature in a descriptive context to aid researchers who are interested in the history of science and how we write about it. The scope of this bibliography is of predominantly English publications from 1953 to 2005, drawn from academic journals, books, newspapers, magazines, broadcast media and a selection of World Wide Web pages. A separate section has been included to give a general overview of the debates over who might have perpetrated the forgery.
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1. Introduction

Piltdown Man (Eoanthropus dawsoni) is the most notorious case of scientific forgery in the history of British archaeology and palaeoanthropology. Although the period from its introduction in 1912 until the exposure of the forgery in 1953 has been well-studied, the literature written after 1953 has received no such treatment. It is the purpose of this bibliography to place this growing body of literature in a descriptive context to aid researchers who are interested in the history of science and how we write about it.

This bibliography covers the post-1953 works in English about Piltdown Man, as well as some in French and other languages. Academic articles and broadcast media are represented, along with books, newspapers, magazines and a selection of World Wide Web pages. One unexplored area is the correspondence of the scientists who were involved in unmasking the forgery; this subject has been partially tackled by Spencer (1990b) but only went as far as 1954. There has been no bibliography made of the entire 1912-1953 period. Quenstedt (1936) gathered approximately 300 references from 1912-1935, and Oakley (1953) was nowhere near as comprehensive seventeen years later. A good source to start with for locating relevant literature published before 1953 is Spencer’s ‘Piltdown: a scientific forgery’ (1990a).

2. A brief historical summary

In 1912 a Sussex lawyer and amateur palaeontologist named Charles Dawson (1864-1916) claimed to have found pieces of a fossilised human skull and brought them to the attention of Arthur Smith Woodward, the head of the geology department at the British Museum of Natural History. Excavations uncovered more cranial pieces, a jaw fragment, a canine tooth, stone tools and animal bones that suggested a late Pliocene or early Pleistocene date. In December 1912, Woodward and Dawson presented Piltdown Man to the scientific community. At first there was a good deal of scepticism over whether the ape-like jaw belonged with the human-like skull, but subsequent finds from 1913 to 1915 along with bones from a second site (Piltdown II) changed many people’s opinions. Dawson passed away in 1916, after which no new discoveries were made.

In the decades that followed, scientists remained divided roughly equally over the skull-with-jaw issue, but the authenticity of the discoveries went unquestioned. From the general public’s point of view, the skull itself suggested the existence of an ancient ancestor whether the jaw belonged with it or not, and it was a source of great national pride. During its heyday, it was used in the evolutionary theories of respected experts such as Sir Arthur Keith, G.E. Smith, A.S. Woodward and others, but with little agreement on where to place it in mankind’s family tree.

Feelings of uncertainty and dissatisfaction over how to interpret Piltdown Man grew stronger as Homo erectus and Australopithecine fossils began to emerge in the 1920s, 30s and 40s. Sherwood Washburn (in Lewin, 1997: 75) recalled: “I remember writing a paper on human evolution in 1944, and I simply left Piltdown out. You could make sense of human evolution if you didn’t try to put Piltdown into it.”

The first step towards a solution emerged in the 1940s when K.P. Oakley of the British Museum rediscovered the fluorine absorption test for relative dating. Using the test on the Piltdown bones, the results increased the likelihood that the skull and jaw belonged together, but also showed that they were much younger than had been previously thought. This created a paradox for an anthropologist named Joseph Weiner. He was aware of the skull-with-jaw controversy, but if the jaw represented a separate creature, it implied that an ape had existed in Britain during the Middle or Upper Pleistocene, which to Weiner made no sense. Learning from Oakley that no one actually knew exactly where the Piltdown II site had been located, Weiner later realised the possibility of forgery. New tests and examinations followed, and the forgery was publicly revealed in late November of 1953.

3. Analytical tests

The official analyses of the Piltdown forgery were published in Weiner et al. (1953, 1955). Other reports by the authors can be seen in Anonymous (1953m, 1954d, 1954g), Oakley (1954b, 1960), Oakley & Weiner (1953, 1955) and Weiner & Oakley (1954). Also see Weiner’s 1955 book, ‘The Piltdown forgery’ (see 15.1.1.). Carbon-14 dating was applied to the Piltdown fossils in 1959 (Hedges et al., 1989: 210; De Vries & Oakley, 1959; Vogel & Waterbolk, 1964: 368). Collagen radioimmunoassay measurements in 1982 confirmed that Piltdown Man’s jaw had come from an orangutan (Lowenstein et al., 1982; 1985: 545), which had previously been suspected (Harrisson, 1959; De Vries & Oakley, 1959).

The dental wear on Piltdown Man’s teeth was discussed by Murphy (1959) who compared the anatomical methodologies that had been applied by Le Gros Clark and Marston. For another dental study, see Taylor (1978: 362-370; mentioned in Taylor, 1980), who made his original observations in 1937.
Other texts that discuss the analytical techniques that were used on the Piltdown fossils are Glover & Phillips (1965), Hall (1955), Heizer & Cook (1954), Hoskins & Fryd (1955), Lambert (1997: 223-226) and Oakley (1955b, 1956, 1963a, 1963b, 1980a). M. Ashmore (1995) has criticised the use of numerical data in the early analyses.

4. Books and booklets

The primary source to consult is Weiner’s ‘The Piltdown forgery’ (1955; see 15.1.1.). Books that do not overly dwell on identifying who created the forgery are Millar’s ‘The Piltdown mystery’ (1998) and Perrin & Coleman’s children’s book, ‘The mystery of the Piltdown skull’ (2004). The book that most objectively discusses both the history of the forgery and the ‘whodunit’ together is Thomas ‘Le mystère de l’homme de Piltdown’ (2002, see 15.1.6.).

Other books on the subject of Piltdown Man have largely been written for the purpose of identifying specific forger(s), and in the process the authors have tended to accentuate the historical data in their favour. See Blinderman (1986a; see 15.2.1.), Millar (1972; see 15.6.1.), and Walsh (1996; see 15.1.5.).

Spencer’s ‘Piltdown: a scientific forgery’ (1990a; see 15.5.1.) is also a ‘whodunit’ book, but is different by being aimed at an academic audience. It is of particular interest to readers who are interested in the history of physical anthropology, and its companion book (1990b) is meant as a reference work. Another specialised text is that of Russell (2003a; see 15.1.7.) which looks at the career and artefacts of Charles Dawson (see 13.3.).

Less recommended due to their narrow focus and heavy slant are Esbroeck (1972; see 15.10.2.), Vere (1955; see 15.10.1.; 1959; see 15.7.2.). The British Museum published a short leaflet on Piltdown Man in the early 1970s (Anonymous, 1975).

5. Piltdown Man in the context of disciplinary history

How and why the Piltdown Man forgery happened is best understood in the larger context of the disciplinary histories of physical anthropology and palaeoanthropology. Unfortunately, its historical role has been vastly overshadowed by the search for its perpetrator. Although its coverage in textbooks has been common enough, few of the more detailed discussions have been aimed at general readers. Most of the authors presented in this section are either anthropologists by profession or historians of science.

Hammond (1979) and Spencer (1988; 1990a: 1-28) have examined the preceding factors that helped to make Piltdown Man believable in 1912. Spencer has also written a descriptive analysis of how scientific opinions on the fossils changed between 1912 and 1953 (Spencer, 1990a: 29-131).


Also of note are a paper by Sawday (1999) who looked at Piltdown Man in terms of how it supported Sir Arthur Keith’s views on race, and a paper by Sussman (2000) who was interested in the effects that Piltdown Man had on the emerging field of primatology.


6. Books on anthropology, archaeology and human evolution

Almost any book on human evolution or on the history of palaeoanthropology mentions Piltdown Man. Because of this, the list below is not meant to be comprehensive but rather to give examples of texts that have varying amounts of emphasis.

7. General periodical and other articles

Most discussions of Piltdown Man in periodicals and World Wide Web pages are concerned with its perpetrator. However, some cover it in a more general sense without overly placing blame towards any particular individual.


8. World Wide Web pages

As Web pages are likely to disappear or modify their addresses as time goes by, older pages may be found by using online archives such as the Wayback Machine (http://www.archive.org/). The first truly dedicated and comprehensive Web page about Piltdown Man was created by Harter in the late 1990s.


9. Biographical information

For information about various authors mentioned in this bibliography, consult the relevant section, e.g. 15.5.1. for Frank Spencer or the introduction of 15.4. for Martin Hinton. Where possible, references to short biographical descriptions and obituaries have been chosen that date to after 1953, except for famous people about whom much has already been written (Arthur Conan Doyle, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, etc.). Biographical references for authors that do not fit neatly into the other sections are as follows:


Edward T. Hall (1924-2001), sometimes known as ‘Teddy’ Hall, was a scientist who worked with developing new methods to locate, date and authenticate ancient objects. He applied X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy to the Piltdown remains in 1953, and was later involved in dating the Shroud of Turin. See Anonymous (2001b), S. Young (2001).

10. Newspapers and other initial publications, 1953-1955


Since not all of these may be properly indexed (e.g., pre-1980 editions of the London ‘Sunday Times’), it is important to know the major dates around which the story of the Piltdown forgery unfolded from 1953 to 1955. Additional dates and details can be found by consulting Spencer (1990b).

10.1. 1953-1955 chronology

On July 30, 1953 during the ‘Early Man in Africa’ palaeoanthropology conference in London, a tour was given at the British Museum of Natural History where anthropologists Joseph Weiner and Sherwood Washburn had the opportunity to see the original Piltdown Man fossils behind glass. Between them they felt that there was “something not right” (Washburn, 1999), and later that day at dinner with Kenneth Oakley from the museum, they were surprised to learn that no one specifically knew where the Piltdown II site had been located.

Weiner realised the possibility of forgery as he returned home that evening, whereas Washburn returned to Chicago and began to experiment to see if the appearance of Piltdown Man’s jaw could re-created artificially. It is not clear to what degree they confided in one another, but if Weiner had not come forward first, in all likelihood Washburn eventually would have instead.
Around August 6, Weiner gave his forgery hypothesis to his professor, W. Le Gros Clark, along with a jawbone that had been experimentally modified. Clark contacted Oakley by telephone, who agreed that the British Museum needed to investigate. The decision was made to keep it a secret within the museum and to test the hypothesis in as many ways as possible. Over the next year, Oakley coordinated the analyses on the Piltdown assemblage both within the museum and with the help of external laboratories.

By August 17, Weiner had made two excursions to Sussex to investigate the history of the forgery and to possibly discover who was responsible. Weiner’s early research (sometimes aided by colleagues such as G.A. Harrison) steered him towards Charles Dawson as one of several possible suspects. Although Weiner tried to conduct his interviews in such as way as to avoid accusing anyone prematurely, some could tell that Dawson had piqued his interest. Sir Arthur Keith and the late Sir Arthur Smith Woodward were not considered as suspects at the time.

The forgery was officially exposed on Saturday, November 21, 1953. The museum’s investigations were not yet complete, but there was now enough evidence to make the information public. The news was released in the ‘Times’ (Anonymous, 1953a), in BBC radio broadcasts, and in an official publication of the British Museum (Weiner et al., 1953). Weiner and Oakley travelled that day to personally inform Keith, who was 87 years old (Dempster, 1997; Spencer, 1990b: 207, 219).

It is important to note that at this point, the only publicly proven facts were that Piltdown Man’s jaw and canine had been forged. The skull pieces were still considered to be trustworthy fossils of about 50,000 years of age. At first there was hope and confidence that the reputation of the site was still salvageable, but this dwindled as time went on. As early as November 23, two days after the original announcements, it was revealed that bones from the Piltdown II site were also forgeries, and that other items were now under suspicion.

The popular press viewed Dawson as a possible culprit (Anonymous, 1953a, 1954r; Pitts, 2004b) even though Weiner and his colleagues had not yet accused anyone openly. However, it was easy to read an implication into their 1953 report that Dawson had fraudulently stained some of the bones before they had come into Woodward’s possession. Ironically, this idea may have originated with A.T. Marston (Spencer, 1990b: 201-202), who was extremely angry about the affair; he believed that Dawson was innocent and that no forgery had taken place (see 10.9.).

On November 25, the details of the forgery were explained to an audience at the Geological Society of London. The meeting included a scheduled presentation by Marston, but instead of beginning by talking about his studies, he launched into a verbal attack against the British Museum to defend Dawson’s honour. Weiner later denied this had taken place (“There was [...] no disturbance of any kind”, Weiner, 1955: 69), while an American magazine exaggerated it to the point of inaccuracy (“The meeting soon broke up into a series of fist fights”, Anonymous, 1954m). For various reports of this meeting, see Anonymous (1953m, 1953p, 1953q), Cole (1955: 158-160) and Weiner & Oakley (1954). Around the same time, the media’s attention was drawn to a farcical motion in the British House of Commons that attempted to use the Piltdown forgery to shame the British Museum’s trustees (Anonymous, 1953n, 1953o, 1953s, 1953t).

In mid-December of 1953, the stone tools from the Piltdown site were revealed to have been artificially stained (Anonymous, 1953ab, 1953ag; Oakley & Weiner, 1953), which led to a second meeting with Marston at the Geological Society on February 24, 1954 (Anonymous, 1954d, 1954e). Gradually, the British Museum determined that more of the Piltdown finds had been altered and that none of them could have originally come from the site – that it had been a complete sham. On June 30, 1954, another meeting at the Geological Society declared the entirety of the Piltdown site to be a hoax. Marston, still denying that a forgery had taken place, was permitted to make a presentation at the beginning, but the speakers and exhibits that followed largely settled the matter (Anonymous, 1954g, 1954h, 1954j, 1954k, 1954l, 1954n).


Sir Arthur Keith passed away on January 7, 1955. Almost immediately, the ‘Sunday Times’ printed a letter showing that he had come to believe that Dawson was the Piltdown forger (Anonymous, 1955b). This was followed by a series of articles to promote Weiner’s upcoming book ‘The Piltdown forgery’, which was released in mid-February (see 15.1.1.). Vere’s competing book ‘The Piltdown fantasy’ appeared in late April (see 15.10.1). A detailed scientific paper on the forgery appeared on January 21 (Weiner et al., 1955), officially concluding the analyses that had been presented earlier in June of 1954.

P. Teilhard de Chardin passed away in New York on April 10, 1955. A few months later he was accused of being the Piltdown forger by R. Essex, a retired biology teacher (see 15.7.1.).

Sir Wilfrid Le Gros Clark shared his sentiments on the forgery in a lecture to the Royal Institute of Great Britain on May 20, 1955 (Anonymous, 1955h, 1955j; Clark, 1955a, 1955b). After this, Clark’s future publications would only give brief, passing references to Piltdown without much discussion.
On August 6, 1955 it was announced that the right parietal bone of the Swanscombe Man skull had been found, fitting in perfectly with the parts that Marston had found twenty years earlier in 1935 and 1936 (Marston, 1955; Wymer, 1955).

10.2. News announcements


10.3. Editorials, personal columns, short essay pieces


10.4. Letters to the editor


10.5. Editorial cartoons and humor

Illingworth (1953), Kramer (1953), Lancaster (1953), Low (1953), Wilkinson (1953). There were also various poetry submissions (see 14.4.).

10.6. Discussions in British academic journals

The most coverage appeared in the journal ‘Nature’ (Anonymous, 1953w, 1954e, 1954k; Clark, 1955b), who had been told about the forgery’s discovery beforehand (Spencer, 1990b: 203), and later regretted that the ‘Times’ had gotten to announce the news instead (Anonymous, 1954c).

But aside from the articles mentioned in the above sections, there are surprisingly few discussions of the forgery to be found in British academic periodicals (Clark, 1955a; Crawford, 1956; De Beer, 1955; Evans, J., 1955; Vallois, 1954b: 122-123; Zuckerman, S., 1971). This might have been due to the ample coverage in newspapers at the time, combined with the authority of the original reports, or possibly from a desire to be done with the affair once and for all.

The removal of Piltdown Man from the fossil record, although scandalous, did not change the theories of many anthropologists in 1953, even of past supporters such as Hooton and Vallois. It had already lost most of its significance before the scandal, and people were glad that the conundrum had finally been explained. It did, however, serve as a serious lesson in the objectivity of interpreting ancient hominid remains. Anthropologist Sherwood Washburn felt that it gave another justification to his campaign for a ‘new physical anthropology’, moving away from an anatomical tradition of typology and towards a more grounded, interdisciplinary approach.

10.7. Overseas academic discussions


Also of passing interest are comments from the German anatomist and anthropologist Hans Weinert (1954), who at first was willing to give the forgery the benefit of the doubt, but after the full study on the forgery came out, he acquiesced (1958). Weinert had previously examined the original Piltdown specimens in 1932, and at that time had wondered if some of the bones from the two Piltdown sites had been erroneously mixed up.
10.8. Weiner, Oakley and Clark’s later writing

Of the later writings of the three scientists who originally collaborated to expose the Piltdown forgery – J.S. Weiner, K.P. Oakley, and W. Le Gros Clark – Oakley discussed Piltdown Man the most frequently, as he was interested in fossil hominids and dating techniques (Oakley, 1955b, 1956, 1963a, 1963b, 1964: 143, 149; 1965, 1971, 1976, 1980a). Outside his published work, he dabbled in researching the history of the forgery into the 1960s and 1970s, and found evidence that in 1930 the American zoologist G.S. Miller had probably suspected that Piltdown Man had been faked, but had not felt confident enough to come forward (Oakley & Groves, 1970).

Weiner wrote about Piltdown less often. His research had moved on to studying human acclimatisation to temperature, but he occasionally discussed the subject of human evolution or anthropology (Weiner, 1960, 1962, 1965: 7-8; 1967, 1982: 7-8).

Clark, a respected British anatomist, largely confined his opinions to a single, well-spoken lecture (Clark, 1955a, 1955b), and otherwise only mentioned Piltdown Man in passing (Clark, 1954a: 385; 1954b: 291; 1955c: 80; 1960: 98; 1962: 155-156).

10.9. Marston

Several parts of the articles that Oakley and Weiner published in the 1953–1955 period were written in such a way as to hopefully (but unsuccessfully) avoid protests from A.T. Marston (1889–1971), an elderly dental surgeon and amateur palaeontologist. Marston had discovered the Swanscombe Man skull in the 1930s, and for a long time had been engaged in inventing new anatomical tests to distinguish whether fossil hominid teeth belonged to the ape or human lineages. Doing so had made him one of the most vocal proponents that Piltdown Man’s lower jaw was that of an ape and had no business being associated with its skull. Unfortunately, Marston’s anger and disenchantment with the British scientific community, coupled with his amateur status, indignance and repetitive argumentation did not help his cause. By 1955 he had been an outsider and a minor annoyance to Oakley and other British anthropologists and scientists for twenty years.

For reasons that have never been entirely clear, Marston steadfastly refused to believe that Piltdown Man was a forgery. From his comments at the time, it seems that although the British Museum had admitted to error, Marston wanted them to admit to a different error, which led him to defend Dawson’s reputation (Anonymous, 1953p, 1953q). It is also possible that the debunking of Piltdown Man threatened to nullify his research into hominid tooth characteristics. He was not seeking fame for the discovery of Swanscombe Man, knowing that Heidelberg Man was an older European fossil.

Although Oakley and Weiner made occasional references to Marston in their articles, they avoided engaging him in direct argument. They were, however, willing to appear alongside him in presentations made to the Geological Society of London (Anonymous, 1954d, 1954e, 1954g, 1954k; Weiner & Oakley, 1954: 4, 6-7). Marston submitted articles and opinions to a number of periodicals (Anonymous, 1954b; Marston, 1953, 1954a, 1954d), frequently to the ‘British Dental Journal’ (Anonymous, 1953x; Marston, 1954b, 1954c; Oakley, 1954a; Samson, 1953; Scott, 1954). Other authors who commented on his work were Montagu (1954), Murphy (1959) and Vallois (1953a).

The site where Swanscombe Man had been found was declared a national nature reserve in March of 1954. The Piltdown site had been made a reserve in 1952, but this was revoked (Anonymous, 1953af, 1954t, 1954u). Even so, Marston remained disgruntled (Spencer, 1990a: 229 footnote 20). Further excavations in 1955 uncovered a third piece of the Swanscombe skull (Marston, 1955; Wymer, 1955). For more information about Marston, consult various passages in Spencer (1990a, 1990b), Conway et al. (1996: 22-24, 37-46, 247-254), and Carreck (1973).

10.10. 1956 and afterwards

Piltdown Man was written about infrequently during the next fifteen years. At first it was mostly referred to in textbooks, and in the late 1960s interest in the forgery gradually began to grow once more. The sharp decrease in publications after 1955 can be seen below in figure 1. Less than 9% of the references in this bibliography are from the 1958–1972 period.

The period from 1978–1997, representing nearly half of this bibliography’s references, was predominated by no less than twenty attempts to identify the Piltdown forger(s). While some of these accusations have enjoyed a largely uncritical stretch of newspaper coverage, the interest for the public has generally been short-lived.

In 1994, Boxgrove Man was discovered in Britain, extrapolated from a fossil tibia and other items found at an archaeological site. Unfortunately the ‘Times’ broke the story a week before the scheduled press conference and news release (Musty, 1994), using phrases such as “every Englishman may walk a little taller in...
the recognition that he is descended from such a striking creature” (Hammond, N., 1994). The similarities to the nationalism that had surrounded the Piltdown discoveries did not go unnoticed (Cowie, 1994; Dennell, 1994; Querton & Hart, 1994).

Figure 1. Distribution of articles on Piltdown Man over time.

November 2003 marked the 50th anniversary of the exposure of the Piltdown forgery. While it received a good amount of publicity in Britain from the BBC and the Natural History Museum (Anonymous, 2003; Bartlett, 2003a, 2003b; Miles, H., 2003a; Rincon, 2003; Russell, 2003b; Shone, 2005; Stringer, 2003), in the United States it was eclipsed by the 100th anniversary of the Wright brothers’ first powered and controlled heavier-than-air flight (December 17), and by the 40th anniversary of the J.F. Kennedy assassination (November 22).

The 50th anniversary of the exposure was also marked by a resurgence of forger accusations (see 15.1.7., 15.4.5., 15.4.6., 15.4.7.) and by the reprinting of Weiner’s 1955 book, ‘The Piltdown forgery’ (see 15.1.1.). For other articles that appeared around this time, see Pitts (2004a, 2004b) and Stringer (2004), with reactions in Mullan (2004), Padgham (2004) and Russell (2004).

11. Pseudoscientific and anti-evolution literature

Scientists consider the exposure of the Piltdown forgery to be a successful example of self-correction in science (although by no means a timely elimination of error), while its detractors consider it an abysmal failure of scientific trustworthiness. Those holding this latter view have sometimes used human fallibility to advance other arguments generally rejected by mainstream science. For example, the religious Creation Science (or Intelligent Design) movement often uses Piltdown Man to attack the theory of evolution, contending that transitional human ancestors are either fakes or misidentified existing species. However, not all this literature should be considered to be Christian in origin, and the term ‘Creation Science’ itself encompasses a wide range of beliefs (Young Earth Creationism, Old Earth Creationism, etc.). Even so, because publications of this type are largely repetitive in their content, only a few examples will suffice.


For similar arguments from a Hindu perspective, see Cremo & Thompson (1993: 501-525). I. Sanderson used Piltdown Man to advance a cryptozoological argument (1961: 363-365), and the American conservative
historian G. Himmelfarb used it as part of her attack on C. Darwin (1959: 355-357; with a review in West, A., 1959). Also see Esbroeck (see 15.10.2.).

Some authors, while not necessarily being pseudoscientific, have stretched the power of analogy to compare the Piltdown Man forgery with subjects as diverse as the HIV antibody test for AIDS (Ostrom, 1994) and the Dead Sea scrolls (Zeitlin, 1954: 1, 26).

12. Pro-science literature

To discredit pseudoscience, Piltdown Man is occasionally used as an example to support the scientific method and to encourage critical thinking (Langdon and Feder’s articles are particularly well-written). Some authors have also proposed ways to discuss the Piltdown forgery in school classrooms (Vincent, 1999; Williams, 1993).


13. Fraud and forgery

13.1. Fraud and forgeries in general

John Ziman (1925-2005), a physicist who became interested in the social aspects of the scientific discipline, once remarked (1970: 996) that “... the only well-known case [of deliberate, conscious fraud in the world of academic science] is ‘Piltdown Man’, which is more of a monument to the absolute trust that we have in a reputable fellow scientist than an example of a grandly conceived crime.” For a general examination of how and why some scientists have been known to commit fraud, consult Broad & Wade (1982) and Buckner & Whittlesley (1988). The references below largely consist of literature in which Piltdown Man was mentioned along with other cases of fraud and forgery in the fields of science and the antiquities.


13.2. Specific forgeries

This section describes specific historical cases of fraud and forgery for comparative purposes, some of which have been included because they have been of recent interest. For more examples beyond this limited selection, see section 13.1., Palmer (1993), Radford (2000) and Shipman (1992).

13.2.1. Moulin-Quignon

In 1863 the workmen of Jacques Boucher de Perthes, an amateur French geologist, discovered the remains of a human jaw and stone tools. When disagreements arose between French and British scholars over whether the finds were of modern origin or not, a formal debate was held, accompanied by a visit to the site. The outcome of the affair was to support the finds and absolve Boucher de Perthes of any wrongdoing. However, because the sceptical British group only conceded partially and grudgingly to the French supporters, the larger academic community did not take the finds seriously. Boucher de Perthes’ workmen had most likely made the tools, and the jaw was later proven to be recent (Oakley, 1980a: 33).

One of the better articles on Moulin-Quignon is by Boylan (1979), however, as several authors differ on the finer historical details, they should be checked against one another to get a more complete view of the overall story. See Boylan (1979), Cohen & Hublin (1989: 201-221), Cole (1955: 121-127), Millar (1972: 68-75), Pradenne (1952: 65-101), Trinkaus & Shipman (1993: 90-97).

Before Moulin-Quignon, Boucher de Perthes had struggled for years to convince the French scientific establishment of the (then controversial) theory that ancient man had existed in Europe and had manufactured stone tools. This was finally accomplished through the help of British scientists, some of whom later participated in the Moulin-Quignon debate.
13.2.2. The Hastings rarities

In August of 1962 it was announced that some of the Hastings rarities - exotic and rare birds that had been collected in the area around Hastings between 1903 and 1916 - were forgeries, in the sense that they had been secretly imported into the country in refrigerated conditions and then claimed to have been locally shot (Nelder, 1962; Nicholson & Ferguson-Lees, 1962).

The main suspect has been considered to have been a taxidermist named George Bristow, but the degree of his involvement has not been agreed upon (Harrison, J., 1962, 1968). Many of the stuffed birds ended up in the Hastings Museum, having been acquired by a curator and ornithologist named W.R. Butterfield (1872-1935). Butterfield was later implicated in the Piltdown forgery (see 15.10.2.).

Some of the birds have since been shown to be valid specimens. However, according to the museum (Anonymous, 2004), “It is now almost impossible to disentangle fact from fiction, which means the only way forward is to remove all the material from the record.” For related articles, see Alexander et al. (1962), Anonymous (1962a, 1962b, 1962c) and Knox (1992).

13.2.3. The Sherborne bone

In 1911, two British schoolboys in the region of Sherborne claimed to have found an example of Palaeolithic art, consisting of a horse’s head engraved on a piece of bone. Palaeontologist A.S. Woodward published a description of the object in 1914, but several years later the Oxford geologist W. Sollas dismissed it as a forgery. The question of forgery was raised again in the late 1970s (see 15.4.1.), and was verified in 1995.


13.2.4. Archaeoraptor liaoningensis

In February of 1999, a dinosaur-bird fossil was purchased in the U.S. that had been illegally exported out of China from the province of Liaoning, a region where a number of interesting, similar discoveries had already been made. When scientists were brought in to analyse, authenticate and clean the fossil (then called Archaeoraptor liaoningensis) some objections were raised because it showed signs of cosmetic tampering.

Believing that the fossil was reliable, ‘National Geographic’ magazine publicised Archaeoraptor along with a number of other dinosaur-bird fossils in October of 1999 (Sloan, 1999). Meanwhile that same month during the annual meetings of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, the general scientific opinion of Archaeoraptor was one of caution and distrust, going as far as to call it a chimera. In December, a Chinese palaeontologist found proof that it had been made from two different fossils that had been put together. The media was alerted to the forgery in January 2000, and the following April a panel of experts officially verified that a forgery had taken place (Holden, 2000; Reed, C., 2000). Before its exposure, the fossil had received additional media attention due to a small but extremely vocal group of scientists who had differing views of how birds had evolved.

‘National Geographic’ subsequently launched an investigation (Simons, 2000) but could not blame any single individual for the incident. At least one member of the team who had been working with the fossil had been overly optimistic, but disagreements, poor communication, egos and personality conflicts between the team’s members had also made things unnecessarily difficult. Regardless of suspicions that some of them might have had prior to the exposure (Parker, S., 1999: 37), none of them followed through on them.

Unlike the Piltdown forgery, Archaeoraptor received little support after it was first announced. However, like the Piltdown forgery, the provenance of the fossil was unclear, and it was initially attractive to a sub-field of palaeontology in which relatively few specimens were yet known.

The two halves of Archaeoraptor have since been shown to be independently genuine. The dinosaur tail half has been assigned to the species Microraptor zhaoianus, and the front bird half has been matched to Yanornis martini (Xing et al., 2000; Zhou et al., 2002).

13.2.5. Shinichi Fujimura

In November 2000 the ‘Mainichi Shimbun’ newspaper published proof that Japanese archaeologist Shinichi Fujimura had planted objects at two sites in order to ‘discover’ the items later. By October 2001 the number of suspicious discoveries had been extended to include work across at least forty-two sites. Fujimura had been well-known for finding extremely early signs of human occupation in Japan. See Magnier (2000), Normile (2001), Wehrfritz & Takayama (2001), Yamada (2002).
13.2.6. Reiner Protsch, Luk Van Parijs

Reiner Protsch was a professor of anthropology at Frankfurt University who was forced to retire in 2005 following an investigation into fake data he had created that had suggested older ages for human and Neanderthal fossils in Europe (Carroll, 2005; Harding, 2005).

Luk Van Parijs was a biologist specialising in immunology research at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who was fired in 2005 after admitting to fabricating and falsifying data in a published paper and in grant applications (Cook & Bombardieri, 2005; Reich, 2005).

13.3. Dawson’s forgeries

It has been suggested that if Charles Dawson was responsible for the Piltdown forgery, then it might have represented the pinnacle of a larger modus operandi of creating false historical items. After the exposure of Piltdown Man, the new claims of forgery were made by J. Manwaring Baines, the curator of the Hastings Museum. Baines questioned the authenticity of a number of the museum’s artifacts and believed that Dawson had committed plagiarism while writing a book entitled ‘History of Hastings Castle’. See Anonymous (1954p, 1954q, 1954t), Baines (1986: xii, 164, 386), Cockburn, C. (1954), Weiner (1955: 169-188; with reactions in Downes, 1954; Thorne, 1954).

The plagiarism claim has been debated back and forth for years. In 1993 bibliographer Peter Miles found some of Dawson’s long-lost source materials that had been used to prepare ‘Hastings Castle’, and concluded that there was not enough evidence for plagiarism. There was, however (Miles, P., 1993: 370), “loose scholarly method”; and that “as far as his role at Piltdown was to be concerned, such a characteristic qualified Dawson as much for the role of hoaxed as for the role of hoaxer.” Other researchers such as J.E. Walsh claim at least four incidents of plagiarism in Dawson’s writing (Walsh, 1996: 167-168, 184-187), while M. Russell believes there is only one strong case, and that for Dawson’s other texts it is more accurate to refer to him as an editor or compiler (Russell, 2003a: 108-123, 133-135).


There was at least some genuine work that Dawson undertook such as collecting fossil specimens for museums, but in general a feeling of uncertainty and mistrust has surrounded him. Another unresolved issue besides plagiarism is whether he cheated the Sussex Archaeological Society out of their premises (compare Costello, 1985: 168-169 with Russell, 2003a: 15-18, 48-50).

The most complete study of Dawson’s discoveries so far has been by Russell (2003a), and also worth consulting are books by J.E. Walsh (1996) and H. Thomas (2002). Walsh’s book was aided by the discovery of a manuscript in the archives of the Sussex Archaeological Society by R.L. Downes (1923-1981), who had conducted similar research in the 1950s.

J. Clements has theorised about where Dawson could have acquired materials for the Piltdown forgery (Clements, 1997; Hammond, N., 1997). For Dawson and the Lavant caves, see McCann (1997), Russell (2000a; 2000b: 51-53) and Curwen (1954: 121, 129-130). For his mumified toad, see Cooper (1993); for his mammalian fossils, see Clemens (1963), and his stance on eoliths is mentioned briefly in Brewer (1973). In 1990 the British Museum held an exhibition on faked artefacts and displayed a number of Dawson’s objects (Jones, M., 1990: 93-96).

14. Media and entertainment

14.1. Film and video

As it is very difficult to locate information about past recordings, researchers looking for footage are encouraged to contact broadcasters and archives directly. This list should by no means be considered complete.

14.1.1. British sources

The BBC possesses several Piltdown Man-related interviews and news briefs, but only the historical and documentary works will be discussed here. A four-minute Piltdown film reel was put together on December 3, 1953. Archaeologist G. Daniel then discussed the subject for a half-hour episode of his 1955 television show, ‘Buried treasure’ (Johnstone & Daniel, 1955; reviewed briefly in Anonymous, 1955i; Pound, 1955), which was
also turned into part of a book (Johnstone, 1957: 11-24, plus illustrations). A second documentary was produced in 1973 for ‘Chronicle’ (Johnstone, 1973), which was accompanied by a studio discussion (Miles, H., 2003b: 29).

A confusing episode of ‘Q.E.D.’ in 1987 examined the ‘whodunit’ in the style of a Sherlock Holmes investigation (Lynch, 1987). For the 50th anniversary of the exposure of the forgery, a documentary was produced for ‘Timewatch’ (Bartlett, 2003a) that focused on the theory that M. Hinton had been responsible (see 15.4.6.). A year later on November 22, 2004, a segment was produced for ‘Days that shook the world’ in an episode entitled ‘Dinosaurs and duplicity’.

Yorkshire Television examined the possible links between Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Piltdown Man (see 15.3.) in a program entitled ‘Sherlock Holmes and the case of the missing link’, broadcast on October 15, 1992, which was criticised for its inaccuracies (Crombie, 1992).

14.1.2. North American and other sources

The UCLA Film and Television Archives have a Hearst newsreel from November 27, 1953 (‘News of the day’, vol. 25, no. 227), which was made within a week of the announcement of the Piltdown forgery. J.S. Weiner gave a presentation at Georgetown University in 1981 about Teilhard de Chardin and Piltdown (see 15.7.6.). Although the videotaped recording is not of high quality, it does seem to be a typical and lengthy example of Weiner’s standard lecture material (Weiner, 1981).

‘NOVA’ had an excellent documentary in 1988 entitled ‘Do scientists cheat?’ which explored the broader subject of fraud in science. It included a plaster cast of Piltdown Man’s skull being exploded (Buckner & Whittlesey, 1988).

For documentaries that discuss Piltdown Man in the context of human evolution, see ‘The prophecy and the bone’ (Sillen & Horn, 1990), episode four of ‘Ape man’ (Caird, 1994) and ‘Skull wars’ (Lint, 1995). Most of these examine the effect that Piltdown Man had on the interpretation of the Australopithecine fossils, as popularised by P.V. Tobias (see 15.5.2.).

For documentaries that focus more on the identity of the forger than on the history of science, see ‘Hoax of the ages’ (Evans, T., 1997) and ‘The boldest hoax’ (Bartlett, 2005), which was essentially a remade version of the BBC documentary produced two years earlier (Bartlett, 2003a).

14.2. Radio

The BBC broke the news of the Piltdown forgery to the British nation on Saturday, November 21, 1953. For other dates upon which there might have been radio broadcasts about Piltdown, see 10.1.

F. Vere (see 15.10.1.) gave a 15-minute talk on the BBC Home Service at 8:15 p.m. on December 8, 1953, in which he defended Charles Dawson from being labelled as the Piltdown forger (Spencer, 1990b: 226; Vere, 1955: 11-12; Vere, 1959: 16).

The British Library Sound Archive has a BBC recording entitled ‘The full extent of the Piltdown hoax’ which was recorded on June 24, 1954. It seems to have been made in anticipation of the Geological Society meeting of June 30 at which the scientific investigation into the forgery was largely concluded. The recording was broadcast on July 2.

In 1977 the BBC had a brief series of 15-minute programs entitled ‘Scientifically cheating’, one of which was ‘The strange case of the Piltdown skull’ (Taylor, 1980: 232). It was presented by C. Evans, compiled by S. Hedges, and included contributions from scientists M. Day and K.P. Oakley.

14.3. Fiction

14.3.1. Fiction about Piltdown Man

I. Schwartz wrote a novel in 1994 entitled ‘The Piltdown confession’ that worked various historical facts into its plotline. R. Love, an Australian author, wrote a short story entitled ‘The palace of the soul’ about who the forger might have been, inspired by I. Langham’s work (Love, 1993; and 15.6.2.).

In 1975 the Czech author J. Beneš published a Piltdown book entitled ‘Tajemství pana Dawsona’ (Mr. Dawson’s secret). The novel ‘Skullludgery’ by Peter Marks (1987) depicts fictional accounts of the personal lives of scientists such as K.P. Oakley and A.S. Woodward, occasionally focusing more on their sexual fantasies and proclivities than on the subject of Piltdown Man (reviewed in McGrath, 1987; Blinderman, 1987d).
14.3.2. Tangential and allegedly related works

Angus Wilson has stated that his novel, ‘Anglo-Saxon Attitudes’ (1956) was partially inspired by the Piltdown forgery and by his work at the British Museum (Wilson, 1981). Some people have tried to link the Piltdown forgery to Arthur Conan Doyle’s book ‘The Lost World’ and his distant friendship with C. Dawson (see 15.3.). ‘The lost world’ first began to appear in serial format in March of 1912.

J.S. Weiner considered at one point whether R. Kipling’s short story ‘Dayspring mishandled’ was a tangential reference to Dawson (Carpenter, 1954; Spencer, 1990b: 249-250; Weiner, 1955c: 118). When the Piltdown forgery was exposed in 1953, some people recalled that there had been a 1905 novel by Guy Thorne entitled ‘When it was dark’, which involved a fake sculpture of Jesus (Anonymous, 1953r; Blinderman, 1986a: 179).

14.4. Poetry

British poet M. Place published a collection of poems in 1994 entitled ‘Piltdown Man and batwoman’. Much lighter verse has been offered by John Miles (1953) and collected by Guy Walsingham (1953).

14.5. Music

Several bands have named themselves or their work after Piltdown Man, although few have received wide commercial distribution. An early 1960s group calling themselves The Piltdown Men had two hits on Capitol Records with their songs ‘Brontosaurus stomp’ and ‘McDonald’s cave’. An American band called Fidelity Jones produced an album in 1989 entitled ‘Piltdown lad’.

W. Ross, an American composer, wrote a piece for B. Cummings in 1975 entitled ‘Piltdown fragments’, for tuba and electronic tape. ‘Piltdown Man’ (caveman-like singing) was listed in the credits of Mike Oldfield’s popular 1973 debut album ‘Tubular bells’.

14.6. Other manifestations

Since 1953, the word ‘Piltdown’ has typically been used to denigrate or satirise. For example, a column in the December 1998 issue of ‘Anthropology Newsletter’, published by the American Anthropological Association, requested nominations for the unofficial ‘Piltdown Prize’ to be awarded “to whomever or whatever was the biggest banana peel in the road of the discipline in the last year.”

Jokes that have mentioned Piltdown Man have appeared in comedic media such as J. Cleese’s television series ‘Fawlty Towers’ (Cleese & Booth, 1988: 211), and in the 1993 computer adventure game ‘Sam and Max hit the Road’, by S. Purcell and LucasArts. Comic book appearances have included G. Shelton’s ‘Wonder Wart-Hog’ (1989) and R. Walton’s ‘Ragmop’ (1997).

E. Callahan, a professional flintknapper in Lynchburg, Virginia, named his stone tool-making business ‘Piltdown Productions’. When the Power Macintosh 6100 computer was under development in the early 1990s, its internal company code name was ‘Piltdown Man’. Code names for other machines at the time included ‘Cold fusion’ and ‘Carl Sagan’. Angered by what he saw as an unwelcome and uninvited association with pseudoscience, the astronomer Carl Sagan launched two unsuccessful lawsuits against Apple Computer. During the course of the lawsuits the code name for the ‘Carl Sagan’ machine was first changed to ‘Butt-Head Astronomer’ and then ultimately to ‘Lawyers Are Wimps’.

15. ‘Whodunit’ literature

By far, most of the post-1953 literature on Piltdown Man has been concerned with the identity of the possible forger(s). Some have wondered as to the usefulness of this enterprise, leading one author (Millar, 1998: 65) to remark that “Even the Piltdown milkman, or postman, falls into this ‘guilty until proved innocent’ category as do their wives, children, dogs, friends, relatives and acquaintances - in short anything animate in England in 1909, particularly those belonging to the south-eastern part of it.”

On the positive side, the research into the forgery has been very helpful towards understanding how palaeoanthropology developed during the first half of the 20th century. On the negative side, many authors have under- and over-emphasized the historical record to promote their own theories, which has encouraged others to approach the story from a more sensational angle than a historical one. But although there may never be a definite solution to the mystery, the contribution of new data will always be useful towards improving what people see as the most likely possibilities - a situation not so different from proposing a new arrangement for mankind’s family tree based on new fossils.
For researchers who are interested in specific historical figures, this section has been organised by suspect and then sub-divided by accusations made against them (see the table of contents). A chronological index is given in section 15.11.

Since some ‘whodunit’ accusations have received more discussion than others, publication timelines have been included to list things more clearly according to the following arrangements:

- A publication in bold is where the author presented the majority of their claims.
- Publications on the same line together share something in common, e.g. they appeared in the same periodical, are reprints of the author’s work, or were all book reviews from magazines, etc.
- Publications that have received responses are placed on their own line, and the responses are indented on the lines underneath. An example timeline might be:

  A preliminary article.
  
  A primary publication to consult. Or a reprint.
  A response to the primary publication.
  A response to the response.
  A renewed discussion of the primary publication.

Please note that these lists are not in strict chronological order, i.e., the renewed discussion above could have appeared before the response to the primary publication.

### 15.1. Dawson as a suspect

Charles Dawson (1864-1916) was a lawyer, antiquarian and amateur scientist in the town of Lewes who was interested in archaeology and palaeontology. Given his ubiquitous connection with the Piltdown discoveries, it is difficult to construct a case for the forgery in which he was not at least partially involved. Some historians, however, believe that he lacked the required expertise and materials to have worked alone. This section is concerned with theories in which Dawson was considered to have been the sole person behind the Piltdown forgery. For other dubious artifacts associated with Dawson and books that have looked at his life more closely, see 13.3. Some of Dawson’s friends and relatives have defended his character (Chamberlain, A.P., 1968; Postlethwaite, 1953; and 15.10.1).

#### 15.1.1. Weiner, 1955

Joseph Sydney Weiner (1915-1982) was a physical anthropologist and a researcher in human biology that became famous for concluding that the Piltdown fossils were forgeries in 1953. Born in South Africa, Weiner was trained by Raymond Dart and moved to Britain in 1937, where he worked at Oxford and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

Weiner’s 1955 book ‘The Piltdown forgery’ culminated his research into the history of the Piltdown discoveries, told the story of the forgery’s exposure and of his search for the forger’s identity. It remains a standard reference work. Weiner admitted that his case against Dawson was insufficient to prove beyond all reasonable doubt, and this has served as the springboard for all the forgery theories that have followed.

In lectures, Weiner stated that he had not concerned himself with who the forger had been until the scientific investigations of the fossils had been completed and made public (Weiner, 1973b: 25; Weiner, 1981), meaning not until after June 30, 1954. This claim is demonstrably false, as Weiner had finished a draft of his book by August 9, 1954 (Spencer, 1990b: 249), and his correspondence showed a clear interest in Dawson as far back as the summer of 1953 (Spencer, 1990b: 215-240). Aware that other people were trying to ‘scoop’ the Piltdown story (Pitts, 2004b: 9), Weiner wrote his book hastily (Blinderman, 1986a: 105) to get published before Francis Vere’s book appeared (see 15.10.1.).

Weiner had been thinking of re-writing his book in the 1970s, but died before he could do so (Daniel, 1982b; Oakley, 1976: 13). Throughout this time he maintained his belief that Dawson was the sole forger (Weiner, 1974, 1981) and his posthumous comments on the forgery were published in ‘Antiquity’ (Harrison, G., 1983). For obituaries and biographical information, see Anonymous (1982), Daniel (1982b), Harrison & Collins (1982), Reynolds (1982), and Sunderland (1982).

Publication timeline:

Baker (1955), Salzman & Weiner (1955)
Drummond (1955)
Oakley (1955a)

Weiner (1955)

15.1.2 Krogman, 1973

Wilton M. Krogman (1903-1987) was an American physical and forensic anthropologist. After comparing Weiner and Millar’s books (see 15.1.1 and 15.6.1), Krogman concluded that Weiner’s case against Dawson was more convincing (Krogman, 1973, 1978).

15.1.3 Langdon, 1991

John H. Langdon, a professor of human biology at the University of Indianapolis, reiterated the case against Dawson (1991) following Spencer’s accusation of Keith (see 15.5.1).

15.1.4 Nickell & Fischer, 1992

A case against Dawson was raised by Joe Nickell and John F. Fischer in their book ‘Mysterious Realms’ (1992: 131-143, plus figures). Nickell is a member of CSICOP (the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal) and a columnist for the magazine ‘Skeptical Inquirer’, and John F. Fischer is a forensic analyst.

15.1.5 Walsh, 1996

John Evangelist Walsh is an American historian and biographer. His book ‘Unraveling Piltdown’ was aimed at the general public and used a narrative writing style, particularly at the beginning of its chapters and in its final reconstruction of Dawson’s activities. Although this technique tended to blur the distinction between historical fact and fiction, unlike Matthews (see 15.4.2), Walsh provided an ample section of notes describing his sources.

While researching the many other forgeries attributed to Dawson, Walsh discovered an unpublished manuscript by Robert L. Downes (1923-1981) in the archives of the Sussex Archaeological Society. Downes had investigated Dawson’s other forgeries in 1954 (see 13.3.). The reactions to Walsh’s book consisted mostly of book reviews in U.S. newspapers.

Publication timeline:

Walsh (1996)

15.1.6 Thomas, 2002

Herbert Thomas is a science writer and the sub-director of the chair of palaeoanthropology and prehistory at the Collège de France, who published a book in 2002 entitled ‘Le mystère de l’homme de Piltdown: une extraordinaire imposture scientifique’ (The mystery of Piltdown Man: an extraordinary scientific deception). Thomas discussed both the history of the Piltdown discoveries and the forger’s identity, stressing that little about the latter could be proven due to the incomplete historical record. He concluded by neither accusing nor absolving Dawson, although he felt that Dawson probably knew something of the truth before he died.
15.1.7. Russell, 2003

Miles Russell is an archaeologist at Bournemouth University. In 2003 he published the most complete examination of all of Dawson’s discoveries to date, concluding that the majority were fakes or at least clearly suspicious (see 13.3.). Russell’s interest in Dawson seems to have originated from research into Neolithic flint mines in Britain.

Publication timeline:

Russell (2003a)
Currant (2004), Whittaker (2005)
Russell (2003b)

15.2. Abbott as a suspect

William James Lewis Abbott (1863-1933) was an amateur archaeologist and palaeontologist, a jeweller by profession who had a shop in the town of Hastings.

15.2.1. Blinderman, 1986

Charles Blinderman (1930-2002) was a professor of English and biology at Clark University in Massachusetts whose eclectic academic interests ranged from Darwinism to the history of the paper clip. In 1986 he published a book entitled ‘The Piltdown inquest’ in which he accused Abbott of being the forger. Blinderman’s occasionally jocular writing style (e.g. Blinderman, 1986b) made the book easier to read than previous ones on the subject, and at the time it was the most comprehensive work on the forgery available. The early chapters dealt with the history of the discoveries at Piltdown, and then turned to discuss the many theories about the forger’s identity. Blinderman concluded by using the exposure of the forgery as a validation of human evolutionary science.

Although this accusation received little attention from the media, there were a number of academic book reviews. Spencer’s negative comments (1987) should be viewed in the context that he was writing his own book about Piltdown at the time (see 15.5.1.).

Blinderman later created a World Wide Web site that displayed transcripts of many Piltdown Man articles, both pre- and post-1953 (Blinderman & Joyce, 2001). After his death in 2002 his research notes were donated to the archives of Clark University. An obituary to him appears in Melady (2002).

Publication timeline:

Blinderman (1983)
Blinderman (1986a)
Blinderman (1986b)
Eckholm (1987)
Spencer (1987)
Spencer (1990a: 173-175)
Jenkins (1987: 31-34)

15.2.2. Other authors

For other authors who have incorporated Abbott into their theories, see 15.4.2. and 15.4.6.

15.3. Doyle as a suspect

Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930) was the author of the popular Sherlock Holmes detective stories and was acquainted with Charles Dawson. At the time of the early Piltdown discoveries in 1912, Doyle was publishing his book ‘The lost world’. Although the case for Doyle being the Piltdown forger has not been well-received by historians, it has remained attractive to journalists and documentary producers possibly because
Doyle’s name is easily recognised, and more archival photographs of him exist than of the entire Piltdown affair. The earliest suggestion that he was involved was made in 1954 (Watson, 1954).

15.3.1. Winslow, 1983

In 1983, John Hathaway Winslow accused Doyle of being the Piltdown forger in an article co-authored with Alfred Meyer, an editor of the magazine ‘Science 83’. Winslow had previously been affiliated with various institutions as an anthropologist and archaeologist before he retired and settled in Baltimore. He was working on a book about Piltdown (as yet unpublished) and later moved to Florida.

Sherlock Holmes enthusiasts were particularly negative towards Winslow’s theory, and De Waal (1994) has compiled a bibliography of the publications in which their reactions have appeared. Most of them have been in newsletters and fanzines that are not carried by libraries, however both the University of Minnesota and the Toronto Reference Library have special collections in which some may be found.

Publication timeline:

**Winslow & Meyer (1983a)**
- Winslow & Meyer (1983b)
- Erlandson (1983)
- Daniel (1983)
- Hansen (1983)
- Langham (1984)
- Elliott (1988)
- Anonymous (1983a)
- Fernández (1987)
- Crombie (1992)

**Winslow & Meyer (1983b)**
- Winslow & Meyer (1983b)
- Erlandson (1983)
- Daniel (1983)
- Hansen (1983)
- Langham (1984)
- Elliott (1988)
- Anonymous (1983a)
- Fernández (1987)
- Crombie (1992)

15.3.2. Anderson & Milner, 1996

In 1996, Winslow’s theory on Doyle was brought back by Richard Milner, a historian of science and editor of the magazine ‘Natural History’ at the American Museum of Natural History. Milner promoted the theory in interviews and lectures for several years, announcing it first through his colleague and fellow editor Robert Anderson. One of the better (if obscure) rebuttals to it has been written by Elliott & Pilot (1996).

Publication timeline:

**Milner (1990)**

**Anderson (1996a), Anderson (1997)**
- Drawhorn (1996)
- Anderson (1996c)
- Elliott & Pilot (1996)
- Cooke (1996)
- Streeter (1997)
- Dempster (1997)
- Gornall (2003a, 2003b)

15.4. Hinton as a suspect

Martin Alister Campbell Hinton (1883-1961) was a zoologist specialising in mammals at the British Museum of Natural History, from which he retired in 1945. Some of the most complex ideas ever put forward about the forgery have implicated him, involving as many as four conspirators with different motives. The
theories seem to have originated from conversations Hinton had with colleagues who were trying to get him drunk and admit to it (Gardiner in: Evans, T., 1997; Watts, 2003). From there, it is likely the idea spread through professional circles in Britain by word of mouth; many of the authors in this section share backgrounds in zoology or palaeontology.

After Hinton’s death, Robert J.G. Savage of the University of Bristol kept some of his letters and other possessions. Sources indicate that after Savage passed away in 1998, the items were donated to the archives of the British Museum of Natural History. For information about Hinton’s life and career, see Savage (1963) and Stearn (1981: 186-189).

15.4.1. Douglas & Halstead, 1978

James A. Douglas (1884-1978) was the head of the geology department at Oxford University who, before his death, made a tape recording in which he accused his predecessor at Oxford, William J. Sollas (1849-1936), of being the Piltdown forger. After Douglas passed away, the existence of the recording was announced by L. Beverly Halstead (1933-1991), a palaeontologist at the University of Reading. Halstead then went on to extend the list of conspirators working with Sollas to include Martin Hinton, Teilhard de Chardin, and others inside the British Museum (Halstead, 1978b, 1979).

Douglas’ accusation had three effects on the Piltdown literature that followed it. Firstly, Hinton became a recurring suspect. Secondly, academic authors realised that the popular press was willing to publish articles about the forger’s identity even when ‘evidence’ was entirely theoretical or circumstantial. By 1986 there had been six more accusations made. Thirdly, there was a renewed interest in the Sherborne bone, a prehistoric carving of a horse’s head that both Sollas and Arthur Smith Woodward had encountered (see 13.2.3.). Ongoing uncertainties about its possibly fraudulent nature (Farrar, 1979b; Gibb, 1978) were later settled in 1995 (d’Errico et al., 1998; Hawkes, N., 1995; Pearce, 1995; Stringer et al., 1995). A lengthy memorial to Halstead appeared in Sarjeant (1993).

Publication timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parker, R.</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibb</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halstead</td>
<td>1978b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1978a, 1978b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Halstead (1978a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langham</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halstead</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td>1979a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrar</td>
<td>1979a, 1979b, Oakley (1979c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieveking, A.</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrar</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molleson</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieveking, A.</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinderman</td>
<td>1986a: 183-189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1978c, Collins (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1979a, 1979b, Page (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.4.2. Matthews, 1981

Leonard Harrison Matthews (1901-1986) had been the scientific director of the Zoological Society of London. In 1981 he proposed that the Piltdown forgery had been started by Dawson and Abbott, with Hinton and Teilhard later trying to thwart their efforts in secret. Matthews’ theory appeared as a story told gradually over ten consecutive issues of ‘New Scientist’. Unfortunately there was no indication given of which parts were based on the historical record and which parts were Matthews’ speculations.
Publication timeline:

**Matthews (1981)**
Blinderman (1986a: 145-153)
Spencer (1990a: 175-178)

15.4.3. Zuckerman, 1990

Solly Zuckerman (1904-1993) was a primatologist, anatomist and zoologist who had worked as the chief scientific advisor to the British government. In 1990, following the publication of Frank Spencer’s Piltdown theory (see 15.5.1.), Zuckerman proposed that Hinton had been the forger.

It should also be noted that since the late 1940s, Zuckerman had been greatly opposed to the idea that the Austrapolithecines had been mankind’s ancestors. He tried unsuccessfully for many years to get other anthropologists to agree with him, supporting his arguments by making careful measurements of fossils and then applying statistical analysis (Reed, C.A., 1983: 45-55). When the Piltdown forgery was exposed, Zuckerman used it as an example of why his statistical methods were necessary (Zuckerman, S., 1971).

Publication timeline:

Zuckerman, S. (1990a)
Estling (1990)
**Zuckerman, S. (1990b)**
Spencer (1991a)

15.4.4. Thomson, 1991

Keith Stewart Thomson is a biologist, natural historian, and author who has previously been the director of the Oxford University Museum of Natural History. Following the publication of Frank Spencer’s Piltdown theory (see 15.5.1.), Thomson offered a theory similar to Matthews’ (see 15.4.2.), but reduced Abbott’s role.

Publication timeline:

Spencer (1991c)
Thomson (1991b)

15.4.5. Gardiner & Currant, 1996

At some time in the mid-1970s, a trunk that had once belonged to Hinton was discovered in an attic of the British Museum of Natural History. Among the items found inside were papers, vials of dissected rodents and a collection of bones (possibly referred to in Costello, 1981b). Nothing came of it for twenty years until palaeontologists Brian Gardiner and Andy Currant claimed that Hinton had stained and modified the bones in a manner similar to the Piltdown assemblage. Comparisons were made with teeth in the possession of Robert Savage (see 15.4.), who had inherited them from Hinton.

This accusation was well-promoted by the press shortly before Gardiner delivered it in his presidential address to the Linnean Society in May of 1996. Early reports were vague, and although it has been widely cited since then, few historians have given the theory a thorough analysis. Part of this is due to the fact that Gardiner did not formally publish its details for seven years, waiting until 2003 to coincide with the 50th anniversary of the forgery’s exposure.

1996 was a year in which several Piltdown accusations were made (see 15.1.5. and 15.3.2.), and the renewed interest led to a light-hearted debate in March 1997 at the Linnean Society for National science week in Britain (Barwick, 1997). The speakers included Richard Milner arguing that Doyle was the forger (see 15.3.2.), Caroline Grigson arguing for F.O. Barlow (see 15.10.3.), and Herbert Thomas arguing for Sir Arthur Keith (see 15.5.).
For the 50th anniversary of the exposure of the Piltdown forgery, Chris Stringer, a palaeontologist and the head of Human Origins at the British Museum of Natural History, proposed a theory in conjunction with palaeontologist Andy Currant. Stringer believed that Dawson was likely responsible for most of the forgery, while Current contributed Hinton and Abbott as possible conspirators (Watts, 2003).

Concurrently with Stringer and Current (see 15.4.6.), Hugh Miles, the grandson of Joseph Weiner, reported that Kenneth Oakley had harboured suspicions against Hinton and Charles P. Chapman, a young palaeontologist at the British Museum. Oakley had apparently told very few people what he thought about Hinton (Gardiner, 2003: 315-316; Kennedy, 1991: 309), and even fewer about Chapman (Costello, 1986: 147).

Sir Arthur Keith (1866-1955) was an anatomist and physical anthropologist at the Royal College of Surgeons, and a leading authority in England on the evolution of the modern races of mankind. He never participated in the digging at the Piltdown site, but he wrote extensively about the skull. He was still alive when the forgery was exposed. For a description of his life and career, see Clark (1955d).

Ian Langham had previously accused Grafton Elliot Smith of being the Piltdown forger (see 15.6.2.), but he later abandoned this theory in favour of Keith. When Langham died in 1984, his colleague Tim Murray and others salvaged his research by passing it to Frank Spencer (1941-1999), an anthropologist at Queens College in New York, who had come to suspect Keith while writing a thesis on the career of Aleš Hrdlička. Spencer built upon Langham’s work and wrote two books, ‘Piltdown: a scientific forgery’ and ‘The Piltdown papers, 1908-1955’. They were promoted four months ahead of their release on October 2, 1990.
Most of the reactions Spencer received came in the form of book reviews. A few historians had specific disagreements, while others used the opportunity to accuse Hinton again (see 15.4.3. and 15.4.4.). There were also criticisms from people who, like Keith, had been affiliated with the Royal College of Surgeons (Miles, A., 1991; Smith, 1990; and Grigson, see 15.10.3.).

‘Piltdown: a scientific forgery’ was a detailed history of the scientific debates that had surrounded the Piltdown fossils, and only discussed Keith and Dawson as the forgers in its final chapters. Significant extra details were included in a large section of footnotes. ‘The Piltdown papers’ was an annotated collection of the private academic correspondence concerning the Piltdown fossils and the early investigations into the forgery. Although highly valuable as a reference work for the casual researcher, it was by no means a complete record of the letters archived in the British Museum of Natural History and other institutions.

It is unusual that Spencer, who was very thorough in his bibliographic research, neglected to cite Michael Hammond (1979) on the paradigms that had led up to Piltdown Man’s acceptance. This is possibly due to Spencer wanting to focus instead on the pre-1912 British search for eoliths and human fossils from the late Tertiary period (Spencer, 1988; Spencer, 1990a: 1-28).

After 1996, Spencer may have become sympathetic towards the case against Hinton (Spencer, 2000). In general, however, he (Spencer, 1994: 17) observed that “Since 1953, repeated attempts have been made to build cases against the various scientists who were directly or indirectly involved [with Piltdown Man], but, with few exceptions, these cases have not stood up. In all probability, this remaining mystery will never be completely solved to everyone’s satisfaction.”

Frank Spencer passed away in 1999, after which the Smithsonian’s National Anthropological Archive acquired his correspondence and professional papers. Although he is often remembered for his contributions to the Piltdown Man debate, the bulk of his written work during his career focussed on the history of the discipline of physical anthropology. For memorials and obituaries, see Anonymous (1999), Kaufman (1999), and Tobias (1999a, 1999b; with a reaction in Grigson, 1999).

Publication timeline:

Spencer (1984, 1988)
Wilford (1990)
Anonymous (1990a), Nuttall (1990)
Oliver (1990)
Levin (1990, 1992)
Stringer (1990b)
Anonymous (1990b)
Stringer (1990a)
Greig (1990)
Anonymous (1990c), Keith (1990a), Smith (1990)
Costello (1990a)

Spencer (1990a, 1990b)
Bowler (1990)
Saunders (1990)
Zuckerman, S. (1990b)
Spencer (1991a)
Grigson (1990b)
Spencer (1991b)
Grigson (1991)
Walsh (1996: 149-168)
Thomas (2002: 163-191)
Tait (1990)
Keith (1990b)
Shipman (1990)
Costello (1990b), Keith (1990c)
Zuckerman, S. (1990a)
Estling (1990)
Phillip V. Tobias (now retired) was a professor of anatomy, human biology and palaeoanthropology at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa. Adding to the work of Langham and Spencer (see 15.5.1.), he believed that if Keith had been responsible for the Piltdown forgery, then it explained his opposition to the idea that the Australopithecines had been human ancestors.

Tobias has written prolifically and has a personal bibliography of over 900 publications. One of his frequent topics has been to celebrate the life and legacy of Raymond Dart, who in 1925 described the first known Australopithecus fossil, known as the Taung child. Dart’s theory that it was an ancestor of mankind was largely rejected until the late 1940s.

In 1984, Tobias published a biography about Dart and organised a celebratory jubilee in his honour. It was after this occasion that he began to write and often lecture about Piltdown Man. At first he argued that Keith, the Piltdown affair and other factors had caused a delay of twenty-eight years before Dart’s work received proper recognition (Tobias, 1985). His later essays became mellower, describing how Robert Broom’s discoveries of more Australopithecus fossils gradually won over the scientific community (Tobias, 2001), a transition that has also been examined by C.A. Reed (1983). An additional article well worth consulting by Robin Dennell (2001) has an excellent overview of the shifting factors that affected the interpretation of the African hominids.

Several of Tobias’ articles compare the rejection of Australopithecus with the debates over the status of Homo habilis (Tobias, 1991b, 1996), a taxon that Tobias had proposed in 1964 with John Napier and Louis Leakey.

Publication timeline:

Tobias (1985)
Maureille (1990)
Sillen & Horn (1990)
Tobias (1990)
Tobias (1991a, 1992c)
  Dommisse (1992), Hirschson (1992)
  Tobias (1992e)
Tobias (1992a)
Tobias (1992b)
Tobias (1992d)
  Tobias & Kennedy (1993)
  Clermont (1992), Thackeray (1992)
  Tobias (1993)
  Munizaga (1993)
  Walsh (1996: 149-168)
  Thomas (2002: 163-191)
Tobias (1994a)
  Drew (1994)
  Tobias (1994b)
Lint (1995)
Tobias (1999b)

15.6. Smith as a suspect

Grafton Elliot Smith (1871-1937) was an Australian neuroanatomist and an authority on the evolution of the human brain. Like Sir Arthur Keith, he supported the idea that the Piltdown skull and jaw belonged together,
but bitter disagreements over how to reconstruct the skull later ended their friendship. Smith is more commonly remembered for promoting an extreme theory of cultural diffusion in which the origin of civilization was ancient Egypt. For a short biography, see Swinton (1976).

15.6.1. Millar, 1972

Ronald Millar was a historian and playwright who published a book in 1972 entitled ‘The Piltdown men’. The first half of the book discussed the history of geology and human fossils. The subject of Piltdown Man only emerged in its second half, and his accusation against Smith in its last dozen pages. Although it served adequately as a general introduction to the affair for unfamiliar readers, the historical prologue was overly long and the work was riddled with small errors. Millar published a much better, shorter book on Piltdown Man in 1998.

Weiner responded to Millar’s theory at a 1973 symposium celebrating the centennial of Smith’s birth (Spencer, 1990a: 234 footnote 41). Solly Zuckerman, who had organised the symposium, also defended Smith; however his comments were in fact thinly-veiled insults directed towards Richard Leakey, who was there to announce the discovery of the 1470 skull (Lewin, 1997: 163-165; Morell, 1995: 408-411; Leakey, R., 1984: 150-153).

‘The Piltdown men’ renewed public interest in the forgery, as little had been written about it since 1955. After 1972, more artifacts of Dawson’s were analysed (see 13.3.), Oakley delivered a lecture (1976), and the BBC produced a television episode about Piltdown for their archaeology program ‘Chronicle’ (Johnstone, 1973), after which the British Museum of Natural History published a short leaflet (Anonymous, 1974, 1975).

Publication timeline:

**Millar (1972)**
- Anonymous (1972a)
- Anonymous (1972b)
- Zuckerman, S. (1972)
- Daniel (1972)
- Thuillier (1972)
- Davies (1973), Delson (1973)
- Krogman (1973, 1978)
- Swinton (1976)
- Blinderman (1986a: 219-231)
- Spencer (1990a: 172-173)

15.6.2. Langham, 1978

Ian Langham (1942-1984) was a professor in the history and philosophy of science at the University of Sydney. In 1978 he proposed that Smith had been unethically involved with both the Australian Talgai skull and the Piltdown finds, possibly with the help of other people within the British Museum such as Arthur Smith Woodward. A few years later, however, Langham changed his target to Arthur Keith (see 15.5.1.). Langham’s Piltdown research and his sudden death in 1984 inspired a short story by Australian author Rosaleen Love (1993).

15.7. Teilhard as a suspect

In 1912, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) was a French Jesuit priest and an amateur fossil-hunter studying in Britain. While participating in the early excavations at the Piltdown site, Teilhard discovered Piltdown Man’s important canine tooth. He later went on to become a palaeontologist and a controversial religious philosopher. During the late 1920s, he was involved with the excavation of the Peking Man fossils in China (*Homo erectus*). He was still alive when the Piltdown forgery was exposed.

Possibly due to Teilhard’s attempts to combine religious and evolutionary theory, some authors (often citing creationist literature) have attacked him by making his beliefs out to be a form of religious fanaticism (Booher, 1986; Bowden, 1977; Esbroeck, 1972; Vere, 1959). Other authors with scientific backgrounds have been equally uncharitable.
15.7.1. Essex, 1955

Robert Essex was a biology teacher in Sussex at the time of the Piltdown discoveries in 1913. His early attempts to communicate his theory about Teilhard were aggravated by deafness and a poor hearing aid. See Essex (1955), Head (1971), Spencer (1990a: 150-151), Spencer (1990b: 230-235, 241).

15.7.2. Vere, 1959

In 1959 Francis Vere published his second book on the Piltdown forgery. Unlike his earlier work (see 15.10.1.), he changed his target to Teilhard and attacked the way in which scientists had supported the theory of evolution (also see Hillaby, 1973; Weiner, 1973a). ‘Lessons of Piltdown’ was published by the Evolution Protest Movement, which would later become the Creation Science Movement.

15.7.3. Thompson, 1968

William Robin Thompson (1887-1972) was an entomologist and the director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control in Ottawa, whose 1968 article was largely concerned with philosophy and what he viewed as Teilhard’s detrimental application of it to human evolution. Previously, Thompson had written an introduction to Darwin’s ‘On the Origin of Species’ that was extremely critical of the arguments for natural selection (1958). For an obituary about Thompson, see Anonymous (1972c).

15.7.4. Leakey, 1969

Louis Leakey (1903-1972), the famous palaeoanthropologist, hinted at his theory in two books, the first in 1969 and the second (posthumously) in 1974. Although his writing only accused Teilhard indirectly, Leakey did not make any effort to hide his suspicions from his friends and colleagues. In 1971 he spoke at a symposium in honour of Teilhard but did not use the opportunity to discuss Piltdown (Cole, 1975: 374-377; Morell, 1995: 378).

Leakey had apparently been working on a book about Piltdown and Teilhard, but after his death his wife Mary preferred not to pursue the matter further. The unfinished notes were stored in the archives of the National Museums of Kenya (Cole, 1975: 399; Morell, 1995: 394; Tobias, 1990: x).

Early newspaper reports misidentify Louis as ‘James’ Leakey. For a brief memorial to him, see Daniel (1975).

Publication timeline:

Leakey & Goodall (1969: 90-100, 152-156)
Anonymous (1970a)
Austin (1970)
Anonymous (1970b)
Head (1971)
Anonymous (1971)

Daniel (1975)

15.7.5. Bowden, 1977

Malcolm Bowden is a British creationist who has worked as a consulting civil and structural engineer. Two of his books have discussed Teilhard and Piltdown (Bowden, 1977: 3-43; Bowden, 1991: 177-194).

15.7.6. Gould, 1979

Stephen Jay Gould (1941-2002) was an American evolutionary biologist, palaeontologist and science historian at Harvard University. He wrote several popular science books for the general public, some of which were collections of his columns from ‘Natural History’ magazine. In 1979 Gould brought back Leakey’s theory against Teilhard (see 15.7.4.), but it received little attention until he published a more thorough accusation the following year. Like Douglas and Halstead (15.4.1.), the news spread rapidly through the popular press, mainly during the second half of July 1980.

The bulk of the responses that Gould received came from specialists who were interested in Teilhard’s life and philosophies. These biographers, theologians and general enthusiasts continued to comment against
Gould’s theory for years afterwards; McCulloch (1996) has written a summary of some of their arguments. Theologian Thomas M. King organised a symposium in May 1981 at Georgetown University for the centennial of Teilhard’s birth. J.S. Weiner attended and gave a lecture on Piltdown Man a few days before the symposium began (Weiner, 1981).

Some of Teilhard’s supporters mention that scientists Peter Medawar and George Gaylord Simpson had spoken in Teilhard’s defence regarding the forgery. Simpson’s defence (Anonymous, 1980c) amounted to “I don’t think it was in his character.” As for Medawar (1982: 210), his statement did not sound like it was meant to be a defence: “Teilhard […] was in no serious sense a thinker. He had about him that innocence which makes it easier to understand why the forger of the Piltdown skull should have chosen [him] to be the discoverer of its canine tooth.”

Oakley and Weiner might have reacted more fully to Gould, except they both passed away over the course of the debate. Oakley had considered the idea of Teilhard’s involvement during the 1950s (Hammond, N., 1980; Oakley, 1980b; Smoker, 1997), however he later thought that Teilhard’s participation was unlikely (Daniel, 1981a, 1982b; Oakley, 1981). Gould’s final comments on the subject had nothing to do with the Piltdown forgery, concentrating instead on Teilhard’s evolutionary views of mankind (Gould, 1983d).

Publication timeline:

Gould (1979a, 1979b, 1980a)
Oakley (1979b)

**Gould (1980b, 1983a)**
Oakley (1980b)
Lukas (1981a), O’Hare (1980)
Gould (1981, 1983b)
Robertson (1984)
Dodson (1981b), Le Morvan (1981), Schmitz-Moormann (1981a)
Oakley (1981)
Lukas (1985)
Thieme (1986)
Blinderman (1986a: 123-143)
Blinderman (1987c)
McCulloch (1987)
Spencer (1990a: 150-151, 182-187)
Clermont (1992), Thackeray (1992)
Tobias (1993)
King (1994)
McCulloch (1996)
Giret (2002)
Thomas (2002: 131-161)

**15.7.7. Booher, 1984**
Harold R. Booher published two articles on Teilhard and Piltdown (Booher, 1984, 1986). His background was in engineering and psychology, and he had been employed as a civil servant in the U.S. Army.

**15.7.8. Thackeray, 1991**

J. Francis Thackeray was a palaeontologist at the Transvaal Museum in South Africa. Of his two articles on Teilhard and Piltdown (Thackeray, 1991, 1992), the second one was a response to Tobias’ accusation of Arthur Keith (see 15.5.2.).
15.7.9. Other authors

For other authors who have discussed Teilhard, see 15.4.1., 15.4.2., 15.4.4. and 15.10.2.

15.8. Woodhead as a suspect

Samuel Allison Woodhead (1862-1943) was a chemistry teacher and later a college principal who was acquainted with Charles Dawson.


Peter Costello and Glyn Daniel accused Woodhead of being the forger in late 1985, and then offered additional evidence implicating another chemistry teacher named John Theodore Hewitt (1868-1955). Woodhead’s surviving son, Lionel, contested the theory on the BBC television show ‘Newsnight’ on November 22, 1985.

Both Costello and Daniel had been long-term observers of the debates about the forger’s identity. Glyn Daniel (1914-1986) was an archaeologist and the editor of ‘Antiquity’. He had spoken and corresponded with many of the people who had investigated the forgery, and since the 1950s had done much to popularise the subject of archaeology with the British public. Some of his papers and letters are now housed at St. John’s College Library at the University of Cambridge. For an obituary on Daniel, see Anonymous (1986).

Peter Costello is a biographer and literary historian living in Dublin. Although some articles mention that he was writing a book about Piltdown, he seems to have moved on to other projects. After the 1983 accusation of Arthur Conan Doyle (see 15.3.1.), Costello contacted Dame Jean Conan Doyle and later published a book in 1991 entitled ‘The real world of Sherlock Holmes’.

Publication timeline:

Daniel (1985)
Costello (1985)
Daniel (1986)
Costello (1986)

15.9. Woodward as a suspect

Arthur Smith Woodward (1864-1944) was the head of the geology department at the British Museum of Natural History, a respected palaeontologist and an expert on fossil fish. He had been acquainted with Charles Dawson for many years before Dawson gave him the first Piltdown Man fossils, after which they worked at the site and announced the finds together. Along with Sir Arthur Keith, Woodward was one of the major supporters of Piltdown Man, although the two disagreed on many points.

Woodward has generally not been considered to be behind the forgery. After his retirement in the early 1920s, he moved to Sussex and dug at the Piltdown site for several years without finding anything. His last views on Piltdown Man were published posthumously in 1948 in a book entitled ‘The earliest Englishman’. For recollections of Woodward, see Forster-Cooper (1945), Raymond (1969: 139-144), and Stearn (1981: 234-237); a brief memory of him also appeared in Garner-Howe (1997).

15.9.1. Trevor, 1967

J.C. Trevor (1908-1967) was a physical anthropologist working in the Duckworth Laboratory at the University of Cambridge who thought that Woodward and Dawson were behind the forgery, but never published his suspicions. See Spencer (1990a: 232 footnote 78, 240 footnote 41) and Spencer (1990b: 214-215).

15.9.2. Drawhorn, 1994

Gerrell M. Drawhorn is a physical anthropologist at California State University in Sacramento, who was previously with the University of California-Davis. In 1994 he made a case against Woodward and Dawson at the annual meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists (Drawhorn, 1994). Contrary to some reports, his paper was presented on March 31st, not April 1st. This theory has not been formally published in a scientific journal, but it has been made available on the World Wide Web (Drawhorn, 1999).
Drawhorn’s research uncovered some early applications of fluorine dating in the 1890s by J.M. van Bemmelen. However, his references do not support the assertion that Woodward was aware of the technique.

15.9.3. Other authors

For another theory that included Woodward, see 15.6.2.

15.10. Other accusations

15.10.1. Vere, 1955

In his 1955 book ‘The Piltdown fantasy’, Francis Vere suggested that the Piltdown forger was one of the diggers who had been hired to work at the Piltdown site, possibly implying Venus Hargreaves. ‘Vere’ was the pseudonym of someone named Bannister (Spencer, 1990a: 239 footnote 36) who was racing against Weiner to be the first person to publish a book about the forgery (see 15.1.1.), but lost by approximately two months.

Vere’s book was indignant in tone, and was written to defend Dawson from being labelled as the forger. This suggests that Vere had knowledge of what Weiner was working on, even though Weiner had avoided openly voicing his personal opinions prior to 1955. Some journalists, however, had already seized upon Dawson as the likely culprit.

At the time of the forgery’s exposure, Vere and his wife were lodging with Mabel Kenward (1885-1978), who had been a tenant at Barkham Manor when the Piltdown fossils had originally been discovered on its property. Like Vere, she was convinced of Dawson’s innocence. Vere’s first attempt to defend Dawson was in a 15-minute BBC radio broadcast on December 8th, 1953 entitled ‘Was Dawson guilty?’ (Vere, 1955: 11-12; see 14.2.). A few years later, Vere published a second book in which he accused Teilhard de Chardin of being the forger (see 15.7.2.).

Publication timeline:

Vere (1955)
Anonymous (1955g), Huxley (1955b), Young, B. (1955)

15.10.2. Esbroeck, 1972

Guy van Esbroeck was a retired professor from the University of Ghent who published a book in 1972 entitled ‘Pleine lumière sur l’imposture de Piltdown’ (Full light on the Piltdown deception). Ostensibly, the book blamed the forgery on William Ruskin Butterfield (1872-1935), an ornithologist and curator at the Hastings Museum, and theorised that he was aided by Venus Hargreaves, a labourer from Uckfield who had been hired to dig at the Piltdown site. Most of the book, however, was dedicated to attacking Teilhard de Chardin’s character and, to a lesser extent, the theory of evolution. Esbroeck believed in Cuvier’s successive extinctions and in the creation of new species (Esbroeck, 1972: 46). The reactions to Esbroeck’s book mostly discussed Teilhard. Butterfield’s name is sometimes mentioned in conjunction with the Hastings rarities affair (see 13.2.2.).

Publication timeline:

Esbroeck (1972)
Thuillier (1972)
Russo (1974), Schreider (1973)
Blinderman (1986a: 117-119)
Spencer (1990a: 165-167)

15.10.3. Grigson, 1990

Caroline Grigson has been the curator of the Odontological Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons. Possibly in anticipation of Frank Spencer’s accusation of Keith as the forger (see 15.5.1.), Grigson published her own theory earlier the same year in which she accused Barlow and Dawson (Grigson, 1990a). She later gave a negative review of Spencer’s books (Grigson, 1990b, 1991; with a reaction in Spencer, 1991b). Keith had once worked at the Royal College of Surgeons.

Frank Orwell Barlow (1880-1951) was a technician in the geology department of the British Museum of Natural History who had prepared casts and reconstructions of the Piltdown Man skull.
15.10.4. Miscellaneous suspicions

This section is for references to extremely minor or vague suspicions. G. Daniel in particular had heard quite a few over the years (Daniel, 1961, 1974; Daniel, 1972: 263; Daniel, 1986: 59). Also see Anonymous (1953d, 1978b), Cave (1973), Spencer (1990a: 178, 237 footnote 86), and Spencer (1990b: 211, 227).

Kenneth Oakley was rumoured to have recorded his suspicions on a tape cassette (Miles, H., 2003b: 27) - possibly alluded to in Anonymous (1978b) and Daniel (1982a) - but Oakley’s son Giles has said that a confessional tape does not exist (Pitts, 2004a).

15.10.5. Chipper

One of the more intriguing (if not compelling) theories of who created the Piltdown forgery is that it was Chipper, a goose that roamed the property of Barkham Manor where the excavations were taking place (Kennedy, 1991: 310; Saunders, 1990).

15.11. Chronological index of accusations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Accused</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>15.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Vere</td>
<td>A digger at the site</td>
<td>15.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Teilhard</td>
<td>15.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Vere</td>
<td>Teilhard</td>
<td>15.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Dawson</td>
<td>15.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Teilhard</td>
<td>15.7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Leakey</td>
<td>Teilhard &amp; Dawson</td>
<td>15.7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Esbroeck</td>
<td>Butterfield &amp; Hargraves</td>
<td>15.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Millar</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>15.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Krogman</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>15.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td>Teilhard</td>
<td>15.7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Langham</td>
<td>Smith &amp; Woodward</td>
<td>15.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Douglas &amp; Halstead</td>
<td>Sollas, Hinton &amp; others</td>
<td>15.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>Teilhard &amp; Dawson</td>
<td>15.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>Dawson, Abbott &amp; others</td>
<td>15.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>15.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Booher</td>
<td>Teilhard</td>
<td>15.7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Costello &amp; Daniel</td>
<td>Woodhead &amp; Hewitt</td>
<td>15.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Blinderman</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>15.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Grigson</td>
<td>Barlow &amp; Dawson</td>
<td>15.10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Langham &amp; Spencer</td>
<td>Keith &amp; Dawson</td>
<td>15.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Zuckerman</td>
<td>Hinton</td>
<td>15.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>Dawson, Hinton &amp; Teilhard</td>
<td>15.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Langdon</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>15.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Nickell &amp; Fischer</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>15.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Tobias</td>
<td>Keith &amp; Dawson</td>
<td>15.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Thackeray</td>
<td>Teilhard</td>
<td>15.7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Drawhorn</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Dawson</td>
<td>15.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Anderson &amp; Milner</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>15.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Gardiner &amp; Currant</td>
<td>Hinton</td>
<td>15.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>15.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Dawson (conditionally)</td>
<td>15.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>15.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Stringer &amp; Currant</td>
<td>Dawson, Hinton &amp; Abbott</td>
<td>15.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Chapman, Hinton &amp; others</td>
<td>15.4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Others)</td>
<td>(Various)</td>
<td>15.10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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