

Chapter 3: The Historical Time Frame

Any work of a historical nature should have a proper time frame in order to be accurate and present a proper perspective. A proper time frame should be based on what information is presently available, both scientific and historical. In the quest for truth there is no place for evolution or occult notions that have humanity evolving through countless generations. While many people today do not believe the Bible revelation concerning the origin of man, the theory of evolution is even more unbelievable. Ricki Pavlu tells us science is the knowledge that has come about by the accumulation of facts and natural laws gained by means of experimentation, measurable observation, and precise testing. The moment science steps over these boundaries, it becomes speculative and philosophic. It does so when it jumps from the inorganic to the organic, then from the organic to animal life, and from animal life to the rational and moral. By this jump, science has entered into the discussion of religion and evolutionary humanism (Pavlu, 101-102).

The fact is: Both creation and evolution, as applied to the origin of man, cannot be subjected to the scientific method. Both are based on faith, and as such, are religious in nature. Those who believe in creation believe God created all things. Those who believe in evolution believe in "nature's ability to evolve." No human beings were alive when the world began, so scientific evidence can neither prove nor disprove Creation or evolution. What needs to be realized is that the various theories regarding origins do not belong in the field of science; they belong in religion (quoted in Pavlu, 104-105). So, at the present, both creationism and evolution are simply religious issues. Far more faith is required for the belief in evolution than in Creation, because of its total reliance upon the creative powers of nonliving, nonreasoning matter. Many educated people today recognize evolution for what it is—an atheistic philosophy that interprets facts within its own framework. The evolutionist Horatio Newman acknowledges, "Reluctant as he may be to admit it, honesty compels the evolutionist to admit that there is no absolute proof of organic evolution. The theory of geologic evolution meets with scarcely any opposition today, although its foundations are no more securely based than those of organic evolution" (quoted in Pavlu, 106-107).

The present viewpoint of history, which excludes God, is of recent origin. It does not permit a standard by which to judge chronology. The interpretation of history, as a result, is in a state of chaos. No two scholars seem to agree on anything, and dates differ by wide margins. This is why, as Cyrus Gordon tells us that pioneering work is often accomplished by people who have not been indoctrinated by the professional establishment in charge of history at the universities, institutes, and museums. Professionals who desire smooth careers are indoctrinated along the lines of accepted opinion (Wuthenau, xii). The end result is that the evidence which does not conform to the prevailing scientific opinion will be quickly set aside. As Marek candidly admits, the historian is limited by his own temperament and guided by the spirit of his age (Marek, 119).

The big problem in dating the past by means of geology is that there is no scientific means to determine how fast geological deposits were laid down. Some geologists are not afraid to admit that geology is a very inexact science. The idea that man existed in prehistoric times became popular after the Bible was rejected as a source of ancient history. Prehistory, as such, refers to a vague, hypothetical period of time of which little is known. Donald MacKenzie bluntly states that the word "prehistory" should be discarded. The fact is: The main events of the so-called "prehistoric" period are certainly known. Relics from the past can be dated accurately enough to say that prehistoric time ceases to be prehistoric (MacKenzie, 212). Prehistoric refers to a time before there was historical documentation, so the whole concept of prehistoric is a supposition. It is an assumption used to support the theory of evolution. The historic period—the last 5,000 years—is verified by records, documents, writings, ruins of ancient cities, and artifacts. The supposed

Bethel Church of God

Chapter 3: The Historical Time Frame

proof that details “facts” about the ancestors of man cannot be proven or documented. Most of these so-called ancestors have been conjured up from highly questionable bone fragments (Pavlu, 87-88).

The theory of evolution teaches that the geologic column contains a succession of organisms with the simple in the bottom layers but progressively more complex toward the top. The problem is, however, that there is no place on earth where the geological column exists in this arrangement. No strata have ever been found which accurately depicts this evolutionary column. David Merrell, an evolutionist, admits: “If it were possible to find a place where deposition of sediments had been continuous since the formation of the earth in its present structure, the strata would form a complete geological column, and the included fossils would furnish a fairly good record of the forms of life that had existed during this period. Although some deposits are thousands of feet thick, no such complete geological column is known” (quoted in Pavlu, 66, emphasis ours). If the geological column does not exist, how do evolutionists prove that one should exist? The answer: Fossils are taken from many locations on the globe and arranged in a hypothetical sequence of complexity—the simple on the bottom and the complex at the top. What this means is that the geological column is used to “prove” the theory of evolution, and the theory of evolution is used to “prove” the geological column. This is a perfect example of circular reasoning (ibid, 66).

Evolutionists are not through yet. They use dating methods that also illustrate circular reasoning. The geological column is dated by the use of index fossils, but the strata in which it is found determines the age of the fossil. The evolutionist R. H. Rastall admits: “It cannot be denied that from a strictly philosophical standpoint geologists are here arguing in a circle. The succession of organisms has been determined by a study of their remains embedded in the rocks, and the relative ages of the rocks are determined by the remains of the organisms that they contain.” (quoted in Pavlu, 67). But, evolutionists reason: “We now know that different kinds of animals and plants succeeded one another in time because life has continuously evolved; and inasmuch as organic evolution is worldwide in its operation, only rocks formed during the same age could bear identical faunas” (quoted in Pavlu, 66-67, emphasis ours). Such assumptions clearly illustrate a religious faith. In following the evolutionary line of reasoning, geologists assign the start of the Old Stone Age (Paleolithic period) to a time period 240,000 years ago, and the start of the New Stone Age (Neolithic period) at 10,000 to 20,000 years ago. Isaac Taylor tells us these calculations are rough estimates and should be taken for what they are worth (Taylor, 57-58).

The fact is: In the different strata countless exceptions to this supposed sequence in the geological column exist. While it is true that many fossils follow a pattern in the deposits (for example, corals, trilobites, and mollusks at the bottom; fish, sharks, amphibians, dinosaurs and reptiles in the middle; and man, elephants, horses, apes, and birds at the top), this is exactly what we would expect if there had been a worldwide flood. The first to be covered in the sediment would be found at the bottom in the mud (corals, trilobites, mollusks). Next would be those found in the waters (fish, sharks). Then, those found in the transition zone (amphibians), and finally, creatures of the land (men, horses, elephants, apes, birds). Since there is no record of transition from one creature to another, the geological column fails to prove evolution, but the fossil record does prove there was a worldwide flood (Pavlu, 66-69).

Modern science has been unable to prove the age of manlike fossils. Because of the many problems involved in trying to determine the age of these fossils, no suitable methods of dating human evolution have been developed (Hammond, 36-37, emphasis ours). To be able to tell time and assign dates, any kind of clock, whether mechanical, radiological, or geological, must fulfill two assumptions. These are: (1) one must have knowledge of the rate at which the clock runs, and (2) one must know when the clock began, that is, its zero point. Radiocarbon dating is a case in point. To accurately use radiocarbon-dating, we must know the rate of decay as well as the original and present amount of the radioactive material. The problem is, however, with radiocarbon dating the amount of the starting material is unknown. Textbooks fail to mention this fact. Since it has been impossible to discover ground zero, the accuracy of the method cannot be known. Geological dating, using radiocarbon dating, is based on assumptions taken from strata

and other calculated guesses (The Spotlight, 1986).

When Dr. Libby developed radiocarbon-dating, he first began by determining the age of the object he was examining. He then checked his conclusion against the archaeologists. They, in turn, corrected some of their opinions on the basis of his findings. Since then his methods have been refined and possible error reduced (Marek, 152). But this has not solved the problem. Radiocarbon-dating is accurate about 4,000 years in the past (Pavlu, 164-165). Edward Deevey tells us that the Scientific American admits that while radiocarbon-dating has fulfilled its original promises, in detail it is full of puzzles, contradictions, and weaknesses. It will be a long time, they admit, before radiocarbon-dating will be as straightforward as an electric dishwasher. The amounts of carbon are so small, they cover only the last few thousand years. Radiocarbon-dating cannot be used as a long-term clock and must be compared with "known dates" (Deevey, 87). The idea many people have is that carbon-dating methods used to date fossils is done separately from correlating the strata. This is not true. Derek Ager, a professor of geology at University College, Swansea, Wales, stated: "Ever since William Smith at the beginning of the nineteenth century, fossils have been and still are the best and most accurate method of dating and correlating the rocks in which they occur. . . . As for having all the credit passed to the physicists and the measurement of isotopic decay, the blood boils! Certainly such studies give dates in terms of millions of years, with huge margins of errors. . . . I can think of no cases of radioactive decay being used to date fossils." (quoted in Gish, 91-92). Quite an admission! Gish observes on the same pages that it is fossils, not radiometric dating methods that are used to date rocks.

So, uranium-lead dating has serious flaws. It is impossible to determine the amount of lead deposited in the original uranium-the original setting of the uranium-lead clock. Uranium can be leached out of the stratum by acid water. It has been admitted that many dates obtained by the uranium-lead method are incorrect, and errors as high as 700 million years have been detected (Pavlu, 162-163). John Kizer points out that uranium-lead dating can yield different ages of minerals of the same age and the same age for minerals of different ages. Remember, the geologist must first determine how old the rock is before he can make the correction to measure the age. In other words, to determine the age of the mineral we must first know its age. The flaw in the whole method is illogical (Valentine, 20-21). Dates are massaged and adjusted to fit the conventional wisdom (Gish, 173).

Very accurate methods are available for determining the present ratio of uranium-lead, for example, but there is no direct method to determine what was the original ratio of isotopes in the rock when first formed. The fact is: There is no direct method for determining the age of any rock. So, indirect methods are used which are based on assumptions. While these assumptions cannot be verified, they nevertheless "guarantee" that the ages "calculated" will come to millions or even billions of years. The only exception is carbon-14 dating, which is useful in samples limited to a few thousand years (Gish, 51). A major problem with carbon-dating is that there are comparatively few of the most ancient evidences of man that include carbon, with which to make the test. In some major archeological finds there are thousands of stone monuments, tens of thousands of pieces of pottery, many bone fragments and other remains, but not one single trace of charcoal or carbon. Also, it is difficult to determine if charcoal found in ancient remains is of the same age. Charcoal samples may be more recent refuse (Verrill, 12, fn).

Looking at civilizations, the assumption is that what we see today is an advancement from the "primeval savage" state to that of modern man. The fact is: There is no proof that a supposed original state of savagery led to civilization. What science has done is to take the theory of evolution and apply it to the development of man. It is true that man often passes from a savage to a civilized state, but the opposite is just as true. Civilizations decay and deteriorate into degraded forms. Both savagery and civilization oscillate freely, passing back and forth with equal ease. Outside forces can improve a civilization, but when a struggle for existence sets in, savagery often results. The earliest civilizations were substantially civilized and degenerated into savagery only by degrees, due to peculiar circumstances. The Bible indicates that

Bethel Church of God

Chapter 3: The Historical Time Frame

cities were built before tents, and that copper and iron existed during this time period. Both Egypt and Babylon had high civilizations and no early period of barbarism existed (Rawlinson, 1883, 1-14). As Rawlinson informs us, even Sir Charles Lyell admitted there is no distinct geological evidence that so-called inferior races have always preceded those of a higher order (ibid, 2, fn).

Archaeologists label cultures by the use of implements. We have all heard of the Old Stone Age, New Stone Age, Copper Age (Chalcolithic), Bronze Age (so designated because of the use of chipped stone, polished stone, copper, and bronze). While these designations are useful in identifying cultures, the dating methods used have led to all kinds of inaccuracies and confusion. The reason is because the dates of cultures vary widely around the world. Once established, these designations became impossible to discard and the reader should regard their dates with caution (Langer, 2). Archaeologists have set up a chronological sequence of these ages-stone, bronze, iron-but these ages are not the same in every country. Even today some populations are still practically in the Stone Age, while others have recently just passed out of it (Pittard, 28).

The fact is: It is impossible to depict any "age" solely on the basis of archaeology. The whole idea becomes even less valid when we attach a deeper historical meaning to any particular age. Even in Sweden, for example, varying cultures have existed side by side during what is called the Stone Age. The commonly selected date for the first inhabitants of Sweden has been set at 9000 BC. There are neither discoveries nor experiments to support the notion that cultures existed millions of years in the past (Olson, 5, 7). The advance to civilization has been unequal, some people using stone while others were using bronze or iron. Even during the New Stone Age, people were not mere wandering hunters. They had social organization, industry, a system of trade by both land and sea, and settled in areas where they could procure raw materials for their implements, weapons, and coloring materials (MacKenzie, 86).

At this point the question we need to ask is this: If successions of cultural ages do not exist, how did this concept ever develop? The answer is that in 1816 Christian Jorgenson Thomsen, a Danish authority on ancient coins, was appointed by the king of Denmark to the Royal Commission for the Preservation and Collection of National Antiquities. Thomsen came into possession of a collection of miscellaneous artifacts of all kinds-artifacts of metal and stone which had been found in various burial mounds throughout Denmark. These artifacts had no chronological sequence, so Thomsen simply separated them into three lots-one of stone, another of copper and bronze, and a third of iron. To these Thomsen added pottery, wooden instruments of various kinds, fragments of textiles, and leather garments, according to the artifacts with which they were found. He then looked at writings such as Homer's The Illiad and The Odyssey, which were believed to have been written around 800 BC, and concluded that bronze was in use before iron, and stone must have been used before either. Later, explanatory labels on the public displays of these artifacts suggested that a Bronze Age had followed a Stone Age, and an Iron Age followed a Bronze. Coins found with Iron Age artifacts indicated a 400 BC period. Therefore, it was concluded that the Bronze Age and Stone Age were older periods. Thomsen's method of categorizing artifacts was gradually accepted and is now the authoritative method of classification. The Iron Age was assigned the 400 BC to AD 800 period, and today the entire basis of modern archaeology comes from this three-age system.

The Bible record shows that the pre-Flood civilization was advanced. Not only was metalworking employed, but musical instruments were also invented. Cities were built. A look at Noah's ark indicates that shipbuilding was not a new innovation. So, how did the notion come about that man evolved from an ape and that the development of culture required millions of years? The answer: In the 1830s Jacques Boucher de Perthes wrote several books to prove that man had existed during the Ice Age. He believed the Ice Age to be a period of one million years. The idea was not accepted until Charles Darwin published The Origin of Species in 1859. Darwin's book is what stimulated the idea of prehistoric archaeology (World Book Encyclopedia, s.v. "archaeology"). Historian George Rawlinson tells us that without too much difficulty, we can dispel the illusion fostered by those who say our present state of historical knowledge

requires an enormous expansion of the accepted chronology. Rawlinson says such expansions are excessive, and there is not sufficient evidence to justify them. Until the present time, the general results of historical inquiry render these expansions highly improbable (Rawlinson, 1883, 16). The so-called Old and New Stone Ages are found within the historical period and more than likely refer to cultures in the pre-Flood world. The Nile district was the most ancient development of a higher civilization, and this took place in the post-Flood world (Peschel, 517).

The modern historical premise rests on the idea that God has not involved Himself in the course of history, nor is He likely to do so in the future. Historians give the impression they have all the answers. Kurt Marek says that while the novice student of history may be impressed by the way historians date events that took place thousands of years ago, an examination of the historical record reveals how scanty, inaccurate, and false these records were, even when originally written. Due to wear and abuse many of these records are in bad physical condition. Marek says the more one studies, the less impressed one is with historical dates. The framework of chronological history is a purely hypothetical structure that leads one inevitably to question every date set forth. Historians do not know the correct date for the real beginning of Egyptian history. Correct dates must be set on the basis of assurance, not assumption, and a proper time scheme must be based on clear written records-records which have a connection with Greek, Persian, and Egyptian events. Events back to 1000 BC are fairly well known. Before that time, however, we must deal with myths and narrative sagas. Modern scholars are forced to reckon errors in the second millennium BC, in decades; for the third millennium errors are reckoned in centuries. Kings lists are only valuable in the sense that they show a succession without any fixed historical date. They can be confusing because lists that should have been placed side by side are sometimes added on after another. In addition, several different kings' lists have been joined together resulting in endless confusion (Marek, 133-139).

Scholars today rank archaeological evidence as the most important factor in determining the past (Taylor, 129). Modern scholars, because of a lack of contemporary inscriptions to support ancient traditions, rejected early British chronicles. But if this idea was valid, it would remove the traditional history of Rome, Greece, and nearly the entire Old Testament, as well as much of the history of the early Christian Church (Waddell 1924, 147). Archaeologists have found abundant material, but enormous gaps nevertheless exist (Marek, 122). Rarely does one find an easy equation between historically named peoples and those identified by archaeology (Trump, 214). In America, ancient languages have not been studied by archaeologists, and real reform needs to be made in the study of epigraphy-the art of reading ancient inscriptions (Fell 1976, 12-13).

Students versed in the Bible know that Genesis, chapter one, tells of the re-creation of the earth around 4000 BC-this following a catastrophic destruction. The Flood did not occur until 1,656 years after this re-creation or about 2350 BC. George Rawlinson informs us that the Egyptians had no chronological concept and did not consider eras, or enter into computations of time. Chronology is almost nonexistent on Egyptian monuments. Manetho, an Egyptian priest, composed a history of Egypt. He claimed to have used records from archives preserved in Egyptian temples. He gave the impression that Egyptian dynasties were consecutive and form a single continuous series. Based on his work, a time span of 5,358 years would have been required. The truth, according to Rawlinson, is that Manetho rejected the knowledge that many Egyptian dynasties were contemporary. Rather, he insisted they were successive. Rawlinson states that an established Egyptian monarchy began between 2450 and 2250 BC. (Note: According to the Bible record, the first monarchy in Egypt could not have started before 2350 because of the Flood.) Manetho's agenda was to set up a successive arrangement of dynasties, in order to make Egyptian civilization appear to be older than that of Babylon. The two civilizations were relatively contemporary in their origin, and it is quite possible the Old Stone Age of the west was concurrent with early Egyptian civilization (Rawlinson 1887, 22-3 7, 160).

Bethel Church of God

Chapter 3: The Historical Time Frame

As far as chronology is concerned, the Greeks are another case in point. Aside from the Olympic games, the Greeks had no method of precise time reckoning. They had no historical sense, ignored dates, and lumped events and personages together until Greek history became a mass of wild confusion (Marek, 133). It is with confidence that cuneiform scholars place the beginning of Babylon at about 2300 BC, Assyria at about 1500, and Phœnicia at about the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries BC. The European civilization of which Homer speaks must have commenced at about 1200 to 1300 BC (Rawlinson 1887, 148-149). Historians regard "real history" to have commenced about 550 BC (Trump, 250).

The Bible tells us that after the Flood, the ark came to rest on the mountains of Ararat (Gen. 8:4). In the Bible, Ararat is not the name of a mountain, and according to what native Armenians say, was never called that by them. Another consideration is that if the descendants of Noah settled near where the ark is alleged to have rested, how could they have approached the plain of Shinar from the east (Gen. 11:2)? While the ark was stationary for a time over the mountains of Ararat, it is possible it drifted a considerable distance to the east before the waters subsided (McClintock and Strong, s.v. "Ararat"). Whatever the truth is, topological conditions, as they exist in Persia today, would have precluded it from being the center of the dispersion of the human race. The reader should keep in mind, however, that conditions in Persia have not always been as they now are. There is a long tradition that the origin of the dispersion of the races was somewhere in Asia. As scholars view it, centers of dispersion could have been along the shores of the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean, with the core components located near the foot of the western Asiatic mountains (Fasken, 24-25). These different ideas mean scholars are by no means sure of the origin of the first civilization in the post-Flood world. Climatic changes, which have played a very important part in the migrations of various races, indicate that much of the Near East at one time was much less arid than it is today. Areas that earlier supported vast populations, and made material wealth and culture readily available, are now largely parched. Only meager and backward people can be sustained there today (Kephart, 179). The earliest known civilization developed north of the Persian Gulf among the Sumerians. So, it was Mesopotamia and the broad valley of the Tigris and Euphrates, that became the cradle of civilization of antiquity (Haddon, 19).

Many years were required for the Flood waters to abate entirely. Early settlers in northern Europe found the land to be wet and uninviting, cold and inhospitable. According to the Swedish authority Olof von Dalin, Sweden for many years was an archipelago amid multitudinous islets. It was for all practical purposes a group of islands. After northern Europe was populated, weather changes made Scandinavia unsuitable for agriculture. Adverse weather conditions developed around 500 BC, and Sweden as well as Finland became drastically depopulated, remaining so for the next 500 years. For centuries, marshy conditions continued in Sweden. At the beginning of the AD period, one of the largest lakes in Sweden was 23 feet higher than it is today. Wrecks of large ships and remnants of others have been found upon mountains and high places, and salt grass was growing far from the seas. Runic stones make note of bridges where no bridges appear to be necessary (Olson, 51-53). Even today, proof that the ice cap is still melting is seen by the fact that Boston harbor has a sea level three feet higher than when the Pilgrims first landed, and over the past 25 years the rate of sea-level rise has been about an inch every ten years (Fell, 1974, 55). The general consensus of opinion is that a great shifting of populations took place shortly before 2000 BC, because of weather changes or climate. This could account for the shift of the Aryans from the east to the region of Mesopotamia, as Aryan kingdoms were established in the Near East. This is why Aryan proper names are found in Mesopotamian records (McGovern, 32).

We will take a closer look at the various nations in the next chapter, but for the purpose of very early history, we should note what the English Assyriologist, Archibald Henry Sayce, said. Sayce asserted that the sons of Noah were each assigned a separate place of settlement. Japheth was assigned the north, Ham the south, and Shem the center. These three are considered to have settled the three zones of the earth, and the nations inhabiting these areas are their children. The three zones were bounded on the north by the Caspian Sea, the mountains of Armenia, the Black Sea, and the islands of the eastern

Bethel Church of God

Chapter 3: The Historical Time Frame

Mediterranean; on the south by the Indian Ocean and the highlands of Abyssinia; on the east by the Caspian and the mountains of Media and Elam; and on the west by the Libyan desert west of the Nile. Canaan and southwestern Arabia were included in the southern zone along with Egypt and the northern part of the Sudan (Sayce, 42). The sons and grandsons of Japheth (Gomer and Javan) were assigned the "Isles of the Gentiles," which is understood to mean Europe and its adjacent islands. This dispersion must have taken place during the time of the patriarchs, and most likely during the days of Peleg (Deut. 32:8, Gen. 10:25). These nations retained their names to the time of Moses and long afterward. Javan is regarded as the progenitor of the Greeks, but the name Iones, which is supposed to come from Javan, was applied to several branches of the family and extended into Macedonia and Thrace. But there we find the Celtæ or Cimmerii, not of the family of Japheth. If they were known as natives of the land in part of their own territories, they must be regarded as intruders (E. Davies, 123-124).

Raymond Capt comments on a statement by George Rawlinson. Rawlinson said the children of Shem drove the race of Japheth into the holes and corners of the earth so that they might be the vanguard of Semitic civilization (Capt, 217). What is known is that by the time of Caesar, the Scythians had spread themselves over Europe, forcing out the more ancient nations before them (Turner, 43-44). The Japhetic stock remaining in Europe appears to be the Lapps, and possibly the Basques (Capt, 217). The Lapps who previously inhabited southern Sweden, Denmark, northern Germany, the British Isles, and parts of France had been forced into the northern regions by a long-headed race from the southwest (Olson, 13, and Ripley 462,). Also, a broad-headed people, now represented by the Alpine type in Europe, invaded that region to force out earlier peoples who appear to have been an Africanoid type (Ripley, 470). These were found there much earlier than the tall, Celto-Slavic people (Taylor, 123). What is generally believed today is that Japheth inherited Europe and is therefore the progenitor of the Gauls (E. Davies, 148).

An ancient Hindu book says that Noah allotted Japheth the entire region north of the Himalayas from sea to sea (E. Davies, 77-78). So, while Noah assigned the parts of the earth to his three sons and their descendants, many of them did not keep their boundaries, and one lineage often settled on the lands of another brother (Gamboa, 21, emphasis mine). Strabo, the Greek geographer and historian, who lived at the beginning of the AD period, divided the world into four parts. He placed the Indians in the east, the Ethiopians in the south, the Celts in the west, and the Scythians in the north (Turner, 43-44). By this time the boundaries of the various families of Noah had radically changed. Ptolemy, the great astronomer and geographer, who lived in the second century AD, constructed a map which showed England as Javan, but said the western isles were inhabited by the descendants of the Hebrew race who were skilled in smelting operations and the working of metals (Haberman, 78). By this statement Ptolemy shows that a people of Hebrew stock, who were both long-headed and broad-headed and of the white race, drove out the original stock that inhabited Europe and the British Isles.