

---

## Chapter 21

### ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATING

#### *Correlating Egyptian and other archaeological dates with the Bible*

---

*This chapter is based on pp. 1069-1087 of Other Evidence (Volume Three of our three-volume Evolution Disproved Series). Not included in this chapter are at least 46 statements by scientists. You will find them, plus much more, on our website: [evolution-facts.org](http://evolution-facts.org).*

**We did not have room in this book for part of this chapter.** Fortunately, you will find all of it on our website, [evolution-facts.org](http://evolution-facts.org). Go to the chapter entitled, “*Archaeological Dating*.” If we had included that chapter, we would have had to leave out other very important material that you needed in this book. The dating of archaeological remains is not a basic aspect of evolutionary theory, as are most of the other topics discussed in this book. —Yet it is part of a larger effort to destroy the foundations of Christianity.

**Creationist books are deeply concerned with vindicating the six-day Genesis 1 Creation of our world, as well as the worldwide Flood in Genesis 6 to 9.** Throughout this book, we have consistently observed that the scientific evidence abundantly confirms both of those great historical events.

Yet there is another aspect of Bible confirmation which is generally neglected: the historic dating of the centuries which followed the Flood. **Secular humanists have ignored and misinterpreted evidence in an effort to push ancient history back thousands of years. The objective has been to contradict Biblical dating in order to undermine confidence in what the Scriptures teach.**

There is abundant evidence indicating that the earliest instances

of human civilization always occurred in the Near East. Such evidence is mute testimony to the fact that the Ark came to rest near there. (The “mountains of Ararat” of Genesis 8:4, 16 were but a short distance northwest of the Fertile Crescent.) Experts in the study of ancient writings have found that the earliest king-lists are also to be found in that general area, which includes Egypt.

**The key to correctly interpreting—or misinterpreting—archaeological finds lies in ancient Near Eastern dating;** for after the Flood people first multiplied in the Fertile Crescent, and from there migrated to Egypt. **All archaeological dating is currently based on certain conclusions made about Egyptian dates.**

On our website, evolution-facts.org, you will find a careful analysis of Near Eastern and archaeological dating; and, in the process, you will learn that **an immense cover-up has taken place.**

Because of this, archaeological discoveries made in Egypt, Palestine, Jordan, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and the Mediterranean Islands are misdated and misinterpreted.

Because secular humanists control a majority of the exploratory funds, written reports summarizing conclusions drawn from digs are dated incorrectly. **Archaeological evidence since the mid-20th century has been twisted to undermine confidence in people, places, and events mentioned in the Bible.**

**A systematic misinterpretation of Near Eastern dating has resulted in discoveries being applied to incorrect time periods. The dating system has been carefully altered so events in the ancient Near East will not fit the Old Testament account.**

Based on Biblical records, the date of the Flood has been variously set at 2300 to 4500 B.C. As a result of careful analysis, the present writer places that event at 2348 B.C. The year, 2348 B.C., would be approximately equivalent to 1656 A.M. (*anno mundi*, “year of the world”), or about 1,656 years after Creation.

Within a century after the Flood ended, Egypt could have been entered and its first kingdom established.

**In reality, archaeologists need the Bible.** It is the oldest historical book in the world. Archaeologists labor under very difficult conditions and need accurate historical records.

***Here are eleven basic problems of modern archaeology:***

1 - Excavations are time consuming. At the present rate, the excavation of Hazor will require 800 years to complete.

2 - Normally only a very small section of an entire site can be excavated, and very little is dug down to bedrock.

3 - The findings are lopsided. The most discoveries are never made, because they have burned or rotted away.

4 - Even those rare discoveries of documents are often undecipherable or misdated, in accordance with the Egyptian dating error.

5 - Only a little more than 200 of the 5,000 sites in Israel and Jordan have been excavated, and less than 50 are major digs.

6 - As occurred at Heshbon, sometimes archaeologists do not know where they are digging, and thus misinterpret the results.

7 - Preconceived opinions keep the archaeologists from the truth. All digs in Moab and Ammon were misinterpreted because it was assumed those nations could not have existed that early.

8 - Less than 5% of the excavated documents are published within 10 years; most never will be.

9 - Uniformitarian thinking prevails. It is theorized that a layer of sediment four feet thick must have taken twice as long to lay down as one two feet thick.

10 - Dates are based on pieces of pottery; and the pottery styles are based on incorrect Egyptian dating.

11 - It is the director of the dig, and the organization funding him, which decides what the conclusions will be.

*Here is what you will find in the “Archaeological Dating” chapter on our website:*

The importance of archaeology. The attempt to wed Darwinism to archaeological dating. Actually, the experts keep lowering the date of the Egyptian First Dynasty. Why the Bible is an important ancient historical record. **Manetho’s Egyptian king-list and problems with it. \*Velikovsky and Courville’s studies.** Events after the Flood [very interesting reading]. **The radiocarbon dating cover-up.** \*Velikovsky’s letters and responses. More problems with radiodating. The accuracy of eclipse dating. **The problem with Egyptian partial eclipse dating. The theorized “Sothic Cycle.” The “astronomically fixed” Egyptian date fraud. The “rising of Sothis” and serious flaws in the theories.** Plus an appendix study on “Near Eastern Mounds.”

*Lowering the Dates*—The very earliest Egyptian date would be the one assigned to the beginning of its first dynasty. Menes was

the first king. Cerem, in his *Gods, Graves, and Scholars*, tells us that the date assigned to that earliest Egyptian event, as estimated by several scholars, has gradually lowered with the passing of time: Champollion: 5867 B.C. / Lesueur: 5770 B.C. / Bokh: 5702 B.C. / Unger: 5613 B.C. / Mariette: 5004 B.C. / Brugsch: 4455 B.C. / Lauth: 4157 B.C. / Chabas: 4000 B.C. / Lapsius: 3890 B.C. / Bunsen: 3623 B.C. / Breasted: 3400 B.C. / George Steindorff : 3200 B.C. / Eduard Meyer: 3180 B.C. / Wilkinson: 2320 B.C. / Palmer: 2224 B.C.

At the present time that earliest of Egyptian dates is considered to be c. 3100 B.C., with some considering 2900 B.C. still better.

“In the course of a single century’s research, the earliest date in Egyptian history—that of Egypt’s unification under King Menes—has plummeted from 5876 to 2900 B.C. and not even the latter year has been established beyond doubt. Do we, in fact, have any firm dates at all?”—*Johannes Lehmann, The Hittites (1977), p. 204.*

***Date of Creation and the Flood***—It should be mentioned at this point that the date of the six-day Creation Week is variously estimated by creationists as somewhere between 4000 and 8000 B.C. As a result of the scientific evidence presented in this series of books, the present writer places it at approximately 4000 B.C.; 4004 B.C. would make it 4,000 years before the birth of Christ.

The date of the Flood is variously set at 2300 to 4500 B.C. As a result of the evidence presented in this book, the present writer places it at 2348 B.C.

Admittedly, both dates are very conservative; yet they are in harmony with both the evidence and the Bible, which is the most accurate ancient historical record known to mankind. The year 2348 B.C. would be equivalent to 1656 A.M. (*anno mundi*; that is, about 1,656 years after Creation).

Within a century after the Flood ended, Egypt could have been entered and its first kingdom established.

But the current theory, based on an incorrect theory of Egyptian dating, and unreliable Carbon-14 data, has made archaeological finds to not support the Bible account of what took place anciently. For example,

But the current theory, based on an incorrect theory of Egyptian dating, and unreliable Carbon-14 data, has made archaeological finds to not support the Bible account of what took place anciently.

For example:

***The Walls of Jericho***—Garstang’s earlier excavation of Jericho discovered they had “fallen flat outward.” He dated them to the time of Joshua’s attack of the city as recorded in Joshua 6. Garstang also found that this earlier level of Jericho, when the wall fell flat, was thicker than usual and burned. What obviously happened was that, instead of looting the city, it had been set afire. This would make a larger tell level than normal. (You will recall that Achan was the only one who took some of the loot.) Thus, the excavation of Jericho perfectly fitted the Biblical record in every way.

*But then the humanists gained control of archaeological digs.*

When Kathleen Kenyon began her dig at Jericho in the 1950s, she dug a small slice—and authoritatively announced that Garstang was wrong; the walls dated to a time that could not possibly fit the Bible account. *But Kenyon’s dates were based on Egyptian dating assumptions.* Why do scholars accept Kenyon’s opinion of Jericho’s wall dates as so very accurate, when the issue of Gezer’s walls continues on in such disarray?

***Location and Dating of Sodom***—When it came to the excavation of a tell on the south end of the Dead Sea, there was great anxiety regarding whether or not it should be identified as ancient Sodom. The implications of that particular Biblical story being true would not be good for our liberal modern world, with its acceptance of practices such as those conducted in Sodom.

For a rather broad overview of the entire problem, we suggest that you go on the internet to our study “*Archaeological Dating*,” on our website: [evolution-facts.org](http://evolution-facts.org).

“If a C-14 date supports our theories, we put it in the main text. If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a footnote. And if it is completely ‘out of date,’ we just drop it.”—*Professor Brew, quoted by J.O.D. Johnston, “Problems of Radiocarbon Dating,” in Palestine Exploration Quarterly 105, p. 13 (1973).*

“The currently accepted absolute chronologies of the Near Eastern civilizations in the second and third millennia B.C. rely ultimately upon the Sothic dating method. Egyptian chronology stands alone as being ‘independently derived,’ and the other contemporary civilizations are dated by cross-reference to it. Powerful arguments against the validity of the Sothic dating method have been presented by Courville and Velikovsky.”—*David J. Tyler, “Radiocarbon Calibration: Revised,” in Creation Research Society Quarterly, June 1978, p. 20.*

**UNFOSSILIZED DINOSAUR BONES HAVE BEEN FOUND**—In 1961, a petroleum geologist discovered a large bone bed in northwestern Alaska. Among them were bones of duckbill dinosaurs, horned dinosaurs, and large and small carnivorous dinosaurs.

At the time, William Clemens and other scientists, from the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Alaska, began quarrying the bone bed.

It took 20 years for scientists to accept that these were dinosaur bones. An initial announcement was printed in 1985 (*Geological Society of America Abstract Programs, Vol. 17, p. 548*).

Immediately afterward, another article describing the site and the remarkable condition of the bones was also published (*Kyle L. Davies, "Duckbill Dinosaurs [Hadrosauridae, Ornithischia] from the North Slope of Alaska," Journal of Paleontology, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 198-200*).

The problem is that these bones are still in remarkably fresh condition. They are not fossilized. The dinosaur bones have yielded the protein osteocalcin. Since long chain proteins naturally fall apart, such a discovery supports a "recent" age for these fossils (*New Scientist, October 31, 1992, p. 18*).

Preservation in a *relatively fresh state* for even 25,000 years is highly unlikely. The obvious conclusion is that these bones were deposited in relatively recent times. This bone bed is stunning evidence that the time of the dinosaurs was not millions of years ago, but perhaps only thousands.

**UNFOSSILIZED BLOOD CELLS IN DINOSAUR BONES FOUND**—The bones of a beautifully preserved Tyrannosaurus Rex were unearthed in 1990. When these were brought to the Montana State University's laboratory, it was noticed that "some parts deep inside the long bone of the leg had not completely fossilized" (*M. Schweitzer and T. Staedter, "The Real Ju-*

*rassic Park," Earth, June 1997, pp. 55-57*).

Mary Schweitzer and her co-workers took turns looking through a microscope at a thin section of this dinosaur bone, complete with blood-vessel channels.

She wrote: "The lab filled with murmurs of amazement, for I had focused on something inside the vessels that none of us had ever noticed before: tiny round objects, translucent red with a dark center. Then a colleague took one look at them and shouted, 'You've got red blood cells! You've got red blood cells!'"—*Ibid.*

Then Schweitzer confronted her boss, the well-known archaeologist, "Dinosaur" Jack Horner.

"'I can't believe it,' she said, 'The bones, after all, are 65 million years old. How could blood cells survive that long?' 'How about you try to prove they are NOT red blood cells,' responded Horner."—*Ibid.*

So she tried. And the verdict? "So far we haven't been able to" (*ibid.*).

The evidence, that hemoglobin (the oxygen-carrying protein which makes blood red) has survived—and casts immense doubt upon the "millions of years" theory.

*Here is that evidence:*

The tissue was colored reddish brown, the color of hemoglobin, as was liquid extracted from the dinosaur tissue. Hemoglobin contains heme units. Chemical signatures unique to heme were found in the specimens, when certain wavelengths of laser light were applied. Because it contains iron, heme reacts to magnetic fields differently from other proteins. Extracts from this specimen reacted in the same way as modern heme compounds. To ensure that the samples had not been contaminated with heme-containing bacteria (which always lack the protein hemoglobin), extracts were injected over several weeks into rats. No antibodies were formed.

The process of biochemical decay starts soon after death. These cells should long since have disintegrated—unless they are a few thousand years old.

**CHAPTER 21 - STUDY AND REVIEW QUESTIONS  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATING**

GRADES 5 TO 12 ON A GRADUATED SCALE

*Use the data found in chapter 35, Archaeological Dating, on our website, in preparing answers to the following:*

1 - This chapter is not directly about evolutionary teaching, but the dating of ancient history. Why is this chapter important?

2 - The earliest Egyptian date was set at nearly 6000 B.C. Gradually it kept coming down. What date is it down to now? How does that compare with the conservative date for the Flood? Memorize the suggested conservative date for the Flood and Creation.

3 - List 5 of the 11 reasons why modern archaeological work tends to be confused and inaccurate in its conclusions.

4 - Write a paper on the walls of Jericho and the dating of Sodom, as an example of prejudice applied to archaeological findings.

5 - Write a paper on Manetho and the reliability of his king-list.

6 - Write a paper on Velikovsky and Courville's research into early dating.

7 - Write a paper on the descent from the Ark into Mesopotamia and the Babel incident.

8 - Write a paper on the migration into Egypt.

9 - Write a paper on the radiocarbon cover-up.

10 - Write a paper on eclipse dating.

11 - Write a paper on the Sothic Cycle.

12 - Write a paper on the "rising of Sothis" and problems with the theory about it.

13 - Write a paper on the three Egyptian seasons and the second Egyptian calendar.

14 - Write a paper on the conclusion, as it applies to Manetho, eclipse dating, Sothis, and its rising.

15 - Write a paper on Near Neareastern mounds (in the appendix).