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Why am I writing this report?

Because of a message I received this week. An important one.

You see, an ancient document says the most opulent golden structure in the world was erected in Jerusalem in Israel. The walls of Solomon's Temple were lined with gold. There was not enough gold in all of ancient Israel to accomplish that task.

So the builder — King Solomon — sent huge ships to the ends of the earth in his quest for gold and silver. The voyages took three years.

Well, my friend George brought me a paper “disproving” this.

“I don’t think Solomon was the great king the Hebrew document says he was,” said George. “Look, at the time Solomon is supposed to have reigned, there was poverty, a depleted population, and a ridiculously tiny Jerusalem.

“Certainly no evidence of any world famous monarch like Solomon. So?”

Well, I love a mystery. And, after a fascinating two months of investigation, I handed George my 73 page report.

Almost as a footnote, I mentioned that other ancient nations from Ethiopia to India, to Mexico, to South America, confirmed the greatness of King Solomon (Samon).

Then I squeezed in some information about a remote Amazon
tribe, now primitive, who tell of an ancient city called **Ofir** (**Ophir**) which once stood at the mouth of the Amazon River.

The Hebrew records say that Solomon’s ships went to **Ophir** to obtain gold.

This primitive Amazon tribe (with no knowledge of the Hebrew records) says that ships from the east, from Samon’s empire, came to their ancient city of **Ofir** to trade for gold. Coincidence?

To me, the parallels seemed inescapable:

**AMAZON TRIBE’S STORY**
- Samon’s empire across the Atlantic
- Ships to South America
- Destination: Ofir
- Source of gold and silver

**HEBREW WRITINGS**
- Solomon’s empire east of the Atlantic
- Ships to South America
- Destination: Ophir
- Source of gold and silver

But, as you will notice, there appears one difficulty – the vast differences in dating.

**AMAZON TRIBE’S STORY**
- 3166-2866 BC

**HEBREW WRITINGS**
- 970-931 BC

Nevertheless, from my acquaintance with patterns in archaeology, I considered that the 4-point convergence was so strong – and the coincidence so unlikely - that it outweighed the one discrepancy.

So I included this Amazon testimony in my report, despite the dating discrepancy, because I believed both it and the Hebrew account were speaking of the same event.

Of course, if the above four points indicated the same event, then the dating needed a drastic adjustment. But dating problems – and solutions - were not new to archaeology.
“Wow!” exclaimed George, after reading the full report. “Amazing stuff! Why don’t you share this with your email list?”

So out it went.

Among my recipient friends was Jerry, a man for whom I hold a deep respect. Some years ago, while prospecting with his crew in the Amazon jungle, Jerry had been captured by members of this very same tribe. He was their prisoner long enough to learn much of their history, recorded in an ancient document which Jerry termed the *UM Chronicles*.

After reading my 73 page report, Jerry wrote back. One thing, he said, bothered him:

Samon built a new empire across the Atlantic Ocean, but the UM Chronicles say it happened from circa 3,166 to 2,866 BC, after the Flood. This does not drive with your Flood dating 2,350 BC. Since you place Solomon to circa 1,000 BC it is roughly 2,000 years apart so Samon and Solomon could not have been same person.

I thank Jerry for his valued feedback – which prompts this investigation into the dating of ancient civilizations.

Are you ready?...
“Come,” said Bruce, “I’ll show you something.”

We locked the car, and walked into the park.

“This is the Shrine of Remembrance,” explained Bruce, as we approached the concrete structure beside St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Australia. “It commemorates those who died in the war.”

Below the shrine, we descended some steps, to a massive vault.

You might have gasped too, if you had seen it. Would you believe, the vaults resembled the interior of limestone caves. Yes, here were thousands of stalactites and stalagmites! Big ones, too.

“B-but how come?” I stammered. “These shouldn’t be here.”

“Yet it’s true,” said Bruce. “You can see it yourself. These large stalactites have grown in only 59 years.”

Then Bruce grinned cheekily. “I’ll let you in on a secret. One stalactite was sent to Monash University and another to the National University in Canberra. They came back with declared ages of from 120,000 years minimum to 300,000 years maximum. When this dating was challenged, a university response was: ‘But they HAVE TO be that old!’”
Have you ever been into a tourist cave and heard the guide say, “This stalactite took so many millions of years to form”? 

Well, did you know that stalactites have been found growing under many modern buildings?

So whenever you see one hanging from a building, just try to figure out how many thousands of years old that building is!

Now please look at this “origins” list:

- Egypt 6000 BC?
- The Giza Sphinx 10,500 BC?
- The Great Pyramid up to 10,500 BC?
- Sumerian texts 6000 years old?
- Sumerian king lists 432,000 years long?
- Tiahuanaco 15,000 BC?
- Aborigines in Australia for 40,000 years?
- Cave bones in France 12,000 years old?
Atlantis 9600 BC?

Well, what do you think? Would you call those dates realistic?

Apparently so, according to some incoming emails. I am often told that my dates for ancient civilizations are wrong. Here is a sampling of comments:

* I found a rock **10,000 year old** rock with sophisticated inscriptions on it, but archaeologists keep telling me that man was not so clever at that time.

* Like you, I believe there were advanced civilizations prior to our current one, but I tend to believe that there is a longer time frame than you do as I don't subscribe to the notion that the Bible is an accurate gauge. In fact, the Sumerians have a much older history.

Many who thus write are intelligent people, whose opinions on particular matters one should respect.

**MY RESPONSIBILITY TO YOU**

However, with ancient civilizations (including the dating aspect) being my specialty for 25 years, I feel a responsibility toward those who trust me for the truth.

When certain information comes to light that could blow the scientific world apart, does one continue to sit on this dynamite of data, or is it time to light the fuse?

Well, I’ve decided to strike the match. It has to be truth before popularity. So, are you ready? It’s coming to you today with no holds barred.
THE GREAT DATING BLUNDER

We shall take a fresh, new look at all the above numbers, and
more.

There’s a lot of date-guessing out there. Many of the guessers
are well intentioned - and some of their information is correct.
But, if you want to know, much is wrong.

When anyone tells you that something is 10,000 years old, be it
a civilization, an artefact, or whatever, would you please do
yourself a favour and ask him upon what does he base that age.

He may reply that it is confirmed by some radiometric dating
system such as carbon dating, or by the media, or by a “learned
scholar”. And that’s “the final word”!

But, since you value your integrity, then I ask you, please, to not
get too starry-eyed about such figures. Because things are not
always what they seem.

To lay the foundation for this topic, may I respectfully suggest
that you acquaint yourself with the information in my book *The
Great Dating Blunder*. It reveals some discoveries which
threaten to bring our precious dating systems crashing down
around us.

Not only that, but it lays bare the *immensity of a multi-million
dollar cover-up*. You’ll be staggered at the *skeletons* in locked
cupboards, *bones* in forbidden places and *secrets* hidden under
the carpet!

You’ll be shocked to discover that we have been placing our
trust in men who have cheated us. Our dating systems are a
virtual scam.
Just grasp that, and I guarantee you will never see today’s popular dating systems the same way again.

To order the e-book version, please go to http://www.beforeus.com/shopcart_ebooks.html and click on the button for Item No. 14.

For the physical copy, you can go to http://www.beforeus.com/shopcart_hc.html and click on the button for Item No. 52.

Okay, I admit that sounds like a promotion for one of my books. But, let me I assure you, this is not for the money. And to prove it, here’s my guarantee. If you can’t afford this book (the investigation for which cost thousands of dollars) then just email me at info@archaeologyanswers.com, explain your situation, and I shall be pleased for you to download the e-book version free. I make this offer to you, because this information is too important to miss.

Having said that, are you sitting down? Are you ready now for a few shocks?

MY FIRST DISCOVERY SHOCK

Shocks? They’ve been hitting me aplenty. Probably because, not having infinite intelligence, I’ve been asking too many awkward questions.

The first shock struck me like a thunderbolt – during the writing of a history thesis.

It happened when I stumbled upon an ancient artefact that was definitely out of place. According to popular history, it should not exist!

Then I found another one.
At first, I just pushed these out of place artefacts aside.

But as investigations spilled over into more than 30 countries, more of these started cropping up. In fact, so many anomalies continued to surface that, in all honesty, these could no longer be brushed aside. The reality was, there were thousands of them.

More startling still, these were forming into a *global pattern*. Here was evidence of a former worldwide civilization of astonishing proportions!

Now realising the importance of this, I knew that someone had to speak up. So *Dead Men’s Secrets* came into being, a book cataloguing more than a thousand secrets of the lost races and challenging the established teachings. (<http://www.beforeus.com>)

**MY SECOND DISCOVERY SHOCK**

But that was not all. Eventually I was impelled to apply the same investigation strategy to our popular dating systems. And what a shock that triggered!

Getting out my big legal pad, I started making a list of all the questions that just didn’t add up. Questions like these:

* Why do archaeologists *reject* MOST carbon dating results?

* Why did Dr Libby, who won the Nobel Prize for his research on carbon dating, say that modern dating techniques cannot take us back further than about 3000 BC?

Did he really say that? Yes, he did…
LIBBY’S DATING DISAPPOINTMENT

Carbon dating. How does it work?

Cosmic rays from outer space continually bombard the earth. These rays interacting with the nitrogen in the atmosphere cause all living things, animal or vegetable, to absorb radioactive carbon 14 (C14). This continues until the death of each living thing. Then the radioactive carbon begins to break down, and this occurs at an accurately known rate.

To discover how long it is since that living thing died, the residual radiocarbon in the specimen is measured. If half of the original C14 remains, then the age of the subject is very close to 5,568 years. The procedure was tested by using samples with ages already established by other means. And it always checked out. It was natural to assume, then, that it would be equally reliable on samples for which there was no way of determining age.

NO C-14 IN COAL

When samples of coal (from ancient trees) were tested, there was found to be no residual C14. So, assuming that there was the usual amount of radiocarbon in the trees before they died, it was then assumed that the trees must have been dead for a very long time for the C14 to have completely disintegrated. So the
scientists dated the coal at many hundreds of thousands of years old.

So far so good.

NECESSARY ASSUMPTIONS

But the validity of this method of dating depends upon four assumptions:

1. That the amount of cosmic radiation in the atmosphere has remained constant at all times in all places;

2. That the sample tested has not been contaminated by recent microbes or bacteria;

3. That the sample is pure – preserved from leaching, radiation, and so on.

4. That the rate of decay is constant.

ASSUMPTIONS? That’s right. Those ASSUMPTIONS have to be made

When carbon dating was first announced by Dr. Libby in 1949, it was thought to be the last word.

When C-14 dating is compared to firm historical dates, it is generally accurate to within 150 years + or -, although some comparisons show a 250-year difference.

UNRELIABLE BEYOND 4,000 TO 5,000 YEARS

However, even Libby, the developer of C-14 dating, later
admitted his great disappointment in finding that it was not reliable beyond about 4,000-5,000 years, or about 2000-3000 BC. In any case, since about 2000 BC is the oldest firm historical date available, before that year there is no independent means of checking its accuracy.

Very few are admitting it publicly, but the early confidence is no longer justified.

You see, it has been discovered that cosmic radiations vary widely, due to many factors, natural and industrial. *Most results* – that’s right, *most results* - are rendered invalid by absorption, leaching, cosmic radiation, and a proven varied rate of decay. *(See *The Great Dating Blunder*, Chapters 1 and 2.)*

Suppose you enter a sealed room which contains nothing but a burning candle. You are asked to determine how long the candle has been burning.

You soon realise how impossible this is. You could measure the relative amounts of oxygen and carbon dioxide in the room; or you could try to figure out how long the melted wax took to accumulate.
But you cannot know whether someone had opened and re-shut the window. Was it ever put out and re-lit? Could some interruption have caused it to burn faster?

You see, there is room for enormous error.

Dating cannot deal with unique events. They’re gone. You cannot re-run them. You cannot repeat a test on them. A cosmic global disaster, say shortly before 2000 BC, cannot be repeated in the lab. But it would play *immeasurable havoc upon readings prior to about 2,000 BC.*

A series of measurements of samples of known age (from historical records, for example), extending back about 3,800 years, has shown fairly good agreement. However, they become inaccurate on materials which lived before that. And even in that period, considerable correction is at times required.

**ASSUMPTIONS QUESTIONABLE**

The carbon 14 method has been widely accepted in a way that the results do not seem to justify.

It has now been discovered that cosmic radiations vary widely, due to many factors:

1. The magnetic field around the earth (which is now known to be deteriorating rapidly)
2. The amount of water vapour in the atmosphere
3. Solar and stellar activity (Nobody knows, for example, what effect sunspot activity has had over the centuries.)
4. Volcanic addition of non-radioactive carbon dioxide into the air
5. Industrial addition of carbon dioxide into the air
6. Electrical activity
All of these factors are subject to change and all give indications of different conditions in the past.

James R. Arnold of the Institute of Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago, gives a typical scientific assessment:

> So far there is no proof independent of the method, that the cosmic ray intensity has remained constant, and however reasonable it may be, we must rank this as a pure assumption. (James R. Arnold, *Nuclear Geology*, 1954, p. 350)

The so-called “constants” originally accepted can be no longer regarded as “constants”. The consequence is that dating systems are now most suspect.

One problem centres around the constancy of ozone in the upper atmosphere. Other scholars are declaring that great changes, even in radiation, have taken place in relatively recent times.

French scientists Drs. E. and O. Thellier investigated Roman bricks of 200 AD. From the degree of magnetization of amounts of iron in the dried clay compared with such materials today, they estimated that the earth’s magnetic field may have weakened by as much as 65 per cent in the past 2,000 years. (*Scientific American*, vol. 196, No. 2, February, 1957, p.64)

The weakening of this force field cushion around the earth indicates an increase in both cosmic ray intensity in our atmosphere and in radiocarbon in recent times. So declare Dr. Elsasser of the University of Utah and Drs. Ney and Winckler of the University of Minnesota.

If such a phenomenon is general around the earth, it would mean that all radiocarbon datings, especially of more ancient materials, are suspect.

With less radiocarbon in ancient times, organic materials (which
would thus show less radioactivity residue) would now give a false appearance of being much older than they really are.

Clifford Wilson notes:


Gilbert N. Plass, writing in *American Scientist*, concurs that “all radiocarbon dates for events before the recession of the glaciers are in question.” (Gilbert N. Plass, “Carbon Dioxide and the Climate”, *American Scientist*, vol. 44, July, 1956, p. 314)

**THE CARBON-14 COVER UP**

We come now to the most astounding unpublicised fact concerning the Carbon-14 system. This technique has, during its development, uncovered some startling, though publicly undisclosed, evidence of an earth with an atmosphere less than 10,000 years old.

Here it is.

Through the action of solar rays, radioactive carbon is being formed in the atmosphere at a constant rate. This Carbon-14 ultimately enters all living tissues; and much more is absorbed into the ocean. From the time of its formation, it begins a slow decay.

Theoretically, the amount decaying per day SHOULD BE EQUAL TO the amount being produced by cosmic rays in the upper atmosphere. THE SUCCESS OF CARBON-14 DATING DEPENDS ON THIS EQUILIBRIUM.
So here is the crucial question: How long would it take for the Carbon-14 on earth to build up from almost zero to equilibrium?

Scientists have calculated that from the time the build-up BEGAN (in the atmosphere, seas and living tissue), it would take about 30,000 years to reach the volume where daily decay equalled the amount being produced.

Okay, so DOES SUCH EQUILIBRIUM EXIST? Not at all!!!

Balloon soundings show that much more C-14 is still being formed than is decaying. Nobel Prize Medallist Dr. Melvin Cook, using data from several tests, has determined that the Carbon-14 content of our atmosphere IS STILL BUILDING UP. This could be so only if the process had BEGUN RECENTLY. The production-decay rates are OUT OF EQUILIBRIUM by as much as 38 percent! (Melvin A. Cook, “Do Radiological Clocks Need Repair?” CRS. Quarterly, vol. 5, October, 1968, p. 70)

Dr. Cook calculates that such discrepancy between formation and decay indicates an age for our atmosphere of no more than 10,000 years. The likelihood that C-14 was produced at a rate up to three times greater in the past (as evidenced by luxuriant flora and fauna in the worldwide fossil record), would reduce this figure to a mere 7,000 years.

Thus all Carbon-14 dates, when corrected for the known non-equilibrium conditions, would show less than 7,000 years.

W.F. Libby, the discoverer of the C-14 technique, chose to ignore the discrepancy, attributing it to some error of measurement, since he “knew” the earth to be much older than 30,000 years.

But subsequent and better tests have confirmed this lack of equilibrium.
However, this data is routinely rejected. The evolutionary theory, which has permeated the thinking of most scientists, demands vast ages.

This is why such data is not discussed in public literature. This is what those with an evolution agenda don’t want you or your children to know.

**REASON FOR DISCREPANCIES: A PAST COSMIC DISASTER**

I am going to suggest to you that a great cosmic disaster occurred in 2345 BC, which re-set the dating clocks. We shall examine this disaster in a subsequent chapter.

Had the mainstream scientific establishment understood that the earth was originally mantled by a protective water vapour above the atmosphere, they would have known that before the Great Disaster cosmic rays could never have penetrated into our atmosphere as they do today.

Plants and animals did not absorb any radiocarbon 14 before the Disaster. Why? Because the band of moisture filtered the rays out before they ever reached the nitrogen in the earth’s atmosphere.

That’s why scientists found no C14 in the coal – not because it had all disintegrated, but because it was never there originally.

**TRUE COAL AGE**

Had conditions been the same before the Great Disaster as they are now, with no better protection from cosmic ray penetration, then the trees would have absorbed it then, just as they do today.
And when they were buried by the Disaster, the breakdown of C14 would have proceeded – and the measuring instruments today would have shown the coal to be less than 5,000 years old.

In fact, we now know that the Great Flood occurred in 2345 BC. And I shall prove this to you shortly.

If scientists would allow for the great changes that took place at that time, they would also make allowances in their dating and reach a more correct result.

**BEYOND 3,000 YEARS DOES NOT WORK**

Although some scientists using carbon-14 dating will propose dates extending back 50,000 years and even further, Dr George Howe acknowledges that “the men who know the limits of the method, the men who run the tests, would report that they cannot date with accuracy beyond 3,000 years.” (George Howe, *Carbon 14 and Other Radio-Active Dating Methods*, p.11)

He reveals that Geochron Laboratories will return samples to clients if they give a date above 3,000 years, with comments that they are above the age that can be accurately dated.

Dates are assigned by archaeologists *more correctly on pottery styles*. I do not know of any reputable archaeologist who has ever altered his dates after the results of carbon 14 testing. Samples of organic material may be sent for testing but the results will not influence the conclusions already reached.

Are you still with me?

Do these confessions bother you?

Well, I have my own confession to make. As I pushed open
doors sealed to the public, more hidden facts came tumbling out – embarrassing facts about:

• dinosaurs,
• trees,
• ice,
• magnetic reversals,
• petrified men,
• oil and gas,
• coal,
• fossils,
• lakes,
• deltas,
• waterfalls,
• coral reefs,
• deserts,
• the tipping of the earth’s axis, and
• the real age of earth’s civilizations

Embarrassing? You’re so right. Because a lot more awkward questions emerged:

* Why do only a few dating methods suggest an “old” earth?

* Why are these comparatively few “old earth” dating systems widely publicised - while the majority of dating systems, which suggest a “young” age for our earth, ignored?

* Why is vital information being COVERED UP?

* Have we been “conned” by men in high places?
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THE COVER-UP CHEATS

Wake up, Jack! These men are using you like a sucker. They’ve got you mouthing all their myths while they blindfold you and smile.

You may already be aware of the massive scams going on in medicine, the drug industry, politics, religion, and the economy?

But in science?

Well, to put it mildly, I was stunned! Here, by simply following the same worldwide investigative strategy as for Dead Men’s Secrets, I had innocently stumbled upon a bombshell!

Now, if you discovered a major cover-up affecting your childrens’ education system, what would you do? Well, The Great Dating Blunder had to come out. I was angry at being cheated. And I wanted you to know what was happening.

HONEST ADMISISSIONS

Wake up to this. It’s an embarrassing fact. Our popular radiometric dating systems – uranium into lead, potassium into argon, rubidium into strontium, carbon dating - name whichever you like - are all in serious trouble.

We can be thankful that some honest men, like Henry Faul, are not afraid to speak the truth. He admits:
MOST of the ages obtained by the lead: thorium method DISAGREE with the ages of the same minerals computed by other lead methods. (Henry Faul, Nuclear Geology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., p. 295. Emphasis mine)

Did you catch that word “most”? Comparing other dating methods, it’s the same result: there is NO large body of CONCORDANT data, but there is a MASSIVE body of DISCORDANT data.

Another authority admits that no reliable dating system exists:

Age estimates on a given geological stratum by different radiometric methods are often quite different (sometimes by hundreds of millions of years). There is no absolutely reliable long-term radiological ‘clock’. The uncertainties inherent in radiometric dating are disturbing to geologists and evolutionists. (W.D. Stansfield (Instructor of Biology, California Polytech State University), The Science of Evolution. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1977, pp.82,84)

Now, may I ask you this? If you lay in a hospital bed and you overheard two surgeons disagreeing about which of your organs they needed to cut out, would you want to stay there and let them “practise” on you?

Here’s what bothers me. Supposedly careful scientists caught up in this dubious dating dilemma, simply shrug it off.

And here’s one who brags about that:

If a C14 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. (T. Säve-Soderbergh and I.U. Olsson - Institute of Egyptology and Institute of Physics respectively, University of Uppsala, Sweden, “C14 Dating and Egyptian Chronology,” in Radiocarbon Variations and Absolute Chronology, Proceedings of the Twelfth Nobel Symposium, Ingrid U. Olsson – ed., Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, and John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1970, p.35)

I would like you to see a few examples of what’s been going on, so you can better understand the problem.
70,000 OR 9,000 OR 3,500 YEARS OLD?

A skeleton from California was estimated at 70,000 years old (by a technique called a partic acid racemization). (World Archaeology, vol.7, 1975, p.160) In 1981 this age was revised to 8,300 to 9,000 years (by uranium dating). (Science, vol.213, 28 August, 1981, p.1003) In 1983 samples of the same skeleton were dated at 3,500 to 5,000 years (by radiocarbon dating). (Science, vol.220, 17 June, 1983, p.1271)

3 BILLION OR 200 YEARS OLD?

In eight separate tests, scientists dated samples of rock – and arrived at ages of 160 million to 3 billion years. These specimens, from Kaupelehu, Hualalai Volcano, Hawaii, were later found to have formed in a lava flow only 168 years earlier, in 1801. (Science, vol.162, p.265. Journal of Geophysical Research, vol.73, p.4601. American Journal of Science, vol.262, p.154)

DID THIS POOR OX TAKE 16,800 YEARS TO DIE?

Carbon dating is supposed to tell you how long ago the specimen died. With that in mind, consider this:

Muscle tissue from beneath the scalp of a mummified musk ox in Fairbanks Creek, Alaska, was dated at 24,000 years; hair from a hind limb of the same animal was dated at 7,200 years.

Poor creature. What a long, slow death it must have suffered!

My files are crammed with such examples.

Just think about this. Suppose you hired a construction engineer and he came up with contradictory calculations like that, tell me, wouldn’t you dismiss him from the construction job? Well?
DATING DISAGREEMENTS MORE THAN AGREEMENTS

Are *discordant results* the exception? Quite the opposite. They *are the rule*.

FALSE REPORTING EXPOSED

Professor Andrews of the University of London has blown the whistle. He informs us that whatever the figures arrived at by the dating tests, they are weeded out before publication in scientific journals, if they do not accord with the pre-conceived dates assigned to the evolutionary geological column. (E.H. Andrews, Professor of Materials, University of London, and Head of the Department of Materials at Queen Mary College, in his book, *God, Science and Evolution*)

Here’s another honest evolutionist letting us in on their dirty little secret:

… the accepted dates are actually *selected* dates. This whole blessed thing is nothing but 13th-century alchemy, and it all depends upon which funny paper you read. (Robert E. Lee, “Radio-carbon: Ages in Error”, *Anthropological Journal of Canada*, vol.19-3, 1981, pp. 9-29)

THE REAL COVER-UP REASON

Combing through the literature, I found that these facts came as a surprise to most scientists. Many of them were totally sincere. But it’s all they’d been taught. They believed they had found the answer, and they didn’t want someone to come along and tell them it’s all made up. But they were still hiding the facts from their students – and the public. Turn a blind eye.

Something didn’t smell right. And so I began asking, What is going on here?
The game, I discovered, was reputations… credentials… and financial research grants… It’s big business. That’s what is at risk.

I found that many knew, but were playing dumb – fearful of bucking the establishment. Scoundrels – all of them!

And why are we not being told? Because they couldn’t care less about you. It’s about protecting their “sacred” cow.

So it’s whoppers on top of whoppers. So many whoppers… it could make a person sick. The truth? That is decidedly not open to public inspection.

The bottom line is this: Our popular dating systems are based upon a shabby pseudoscience which has acquired a blind popularity. It’s only a theory, but it says that life on earth is an accident, that we have evolved upward by mutations from mud to man.

Of course, we can’t demonstrate this in the short term. But give it say 4½ billion years and maybe a miracle will happen?

Likewise, it is assumed that all natural processes have proceeded without interruption for millions of years… and nothing has ever happened to make these date readings mean something else.

And don’t earth’s physical features look rather old?

However, if you didn’t know, thousands of scientists – including leading atheists - are abandoning this theory. You might want to get yourself up to date on this. (For evidence, see my book The Discovery That’s Toppling Evolution – <http://www.beforeus.com/evol.php> )
THIS AFFECTS OUR DATING OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS

Still, taking on board the popular view that we’ve ascended from a state of savagery to our present civilized state by a slow, uninterrupted development over tens of thousands of years, then there is nothing unreasonable about dates of 10,500 BC for the Great Pyramid, or 20- to 40,000 years for the Australian Aborigines. And dates for:

- Egypt 6000 BC
- The Giza Sphinx 10,500 BC
- Sumerian texts 6000 years old
- Tiahuanaco 15,000 BC
- Cave bones in France 12,000 years old
- Atlantis 9600 BC, and so on.

All very possible if we did not now have access to some pivotal facts…
Eight natural features on our planet tell us that natural processes have NOT continued for aeons without interruption – but that history was dramatically interrupted by a worldwide cataclysm between four and five thousand years ago.

This cosmic disaster was so mighty that no civilization could have survived that event. And therefore no civilization can be dated older than that event.

That event made a clean break in world history. And all the dating clocks were reset at that time.

We shall look at these natural features one at a time:

- Ice and glaciers
- Trapped inland lakes
- River deltas
- Waterfalls
- Coral reefs
- The oldest trees
- Deserts
- Earth’s tilted axis
Then we shall determine more successfully the ages of:

- China
- Britain
- Ireland
- Denmark
- Norway
- Iceland
- Egypt
- The Giza Sphinx
- The Great Pyramid
- Sumeria
- Sumerian pre-Flood king list
- Australian aborigines
- Maya
- Atlantis

…and other civilizations.

First, let me share with you an experience that a friend of mine had in Colorado, USA…

**THE ICE SHOCK**

“You’re kidding!” laughed the lab worker. “You’re trying to tell me it happened only 4,400 years ago!”

“Yes,” repeated Kent. “The surface of this whole planet was remodelled by the Great Global Flood only 4,400 years ago.”

“No way! In case you don’t know, Dr. Hovind, I work at the Denver National Ice Core Laboratory here in Colorado. And we’ve been taking cores of ice from Greenland and Antarctica. It’s dry… very cold…the glaciers are MILES THICK… but their annual growth rings are very THIN.”
He paused to observe Kent’s reaction. Then he thrust home. “We’ve measured the ice… and I tell you, man, it’s 135,000 years old! Your 4,000 years is a joke.”

“I’d like to see your lab,” said Kent, calmly.

The next day my friend Dr. Kent Hovind met the worker at the lab.

The employee ushered him into the giant freezer which stored the long cores from ice drilling.

“See this core from Greenland?” said the worker. “We drilled down and brought it up from 10,000 feet. See the rings? This core takes us back 135,000 years. You’ll notice the rings along its length… dark – light – dark – light.

“Well, these represent annual rings, because in summer the top layer of snow melts and then re-freezes as clear ice, which shows up dark here. In winter, the snow doesn’t get a chance to melt, so it packs – and shows up as a white layer. These layers of dark – light – dark – light, indicate 135,000 summers and winters.”

Hovind looked him in the eye. “Aren’t you assuming those are annual rings?”

Let’s step back a few years… to the famous lost squadron.

**THE LOST SQUADRON**

In 1942, during World War II, some war planes landed in Greenland. When the war ended, those planes were left there and forgotten.

In 1990, an aircraft enthusiast came up with the bright idea to find them and fly them off again.
He organised a group and they went searching. As it turned out, they had to use radar, because the planes were under the ice… in fact, so deep under the ice, the men had a hard job finding them. Do you know, that lost squadron had got covered by 263 feet of ice in 48 years!

Let’s do some arithmetic.

• 263 feet divided by 48 years… that’s an ice growth of about 5.5 feet per year.
• Now divide 10,000 feet by 5.5. And you get 1,824 years for ALL of the ice to build up.

We should allow longer for the fact that the deeper ice is pressed into finer layers.

So 4,400 years is no problem!

Note: those planes did not sink into the ice, due to pressure on the ice. The ice had grown OVER them.

In April, 1999, Kent visited Bob Cardin at his museum in Middleboro, Kentucky. (www.thelostsquadron.com Phone 606 248 1149) Cardin had dug out and was restoring the P-38.

You may be wondering, how did they get that plane out? Ingenious. They had melted a hole down to the airplane, broken it apart and brought up the pieces through the hole.

“When you dug it out,” asked Kent, “did you see any layers of ice… dark – light – dark – light, above the airplane?”

“Yeah, I did, as a matter of fact.”

“How many layers of ice were there?”

“Many hundreds of them.”
HUNDREDS OF ANNUAL RINGS
IN JUST 49 YEARS?

“How could there be many hundreds of annual rings in only 49 years?”

“THOSE ARE NOT ANNUAL RINGS. That’s not summer and winter,” replied Cardin. “It’s warm – cold – warm – cold – warm – cold. You can get ten of those in one day.”

And that’s a fact!

Yet, the scientific elite was still calling them annual rings in 1998. (See Scientific American, February 1998, p.82)

I can’t stop laughing whenever I think about it.

I’m worried. The textbooks you read today are textbooks not only about science, but about evolution. They’re trying to sneak evolution in with the science.

Sneaking beer ads in with football matches doesn’t mean beer is football. Sneaking evolution in with the science, doesn’t make it science.

So let’s take a fresh look at the facts.

Is it possible that a great physical disaster completely re-fashioned the surface of our planet only 4,355 years ago… really?

GLACIERS – c.4,000 YEARS

Field work in the European Alps on the speed of glacier growth and retreat has revealed the fact (surprising to evolutionists) that
numerous glaciers there are no older than 4,000 years. (R.F. Flint, *Glacial Geology and the Pleistocene Epoch*, p.491)

The eminent French geologist A. Cochen de Lapparent noted the expansion rate of today’s larger glaciers. For example, Mer de Glace, on Mont Blanc, moves 50 centimetres a day. The Rhone Glacier would at this rate have taken 2,475 years to expand to its maximum from Valais to Lyons.

De Lapparent then compared the terminal moraines (debris) of several modern glaciers with those left by the Rhone Glacier when it retreated from its maximum expansion. The Rhone Glacier had taken 2,400 years to retreat.

Thus the *total period of advance and retreat* was 4,875 years.

Now, just suppose there was a global disaster just over 4,000 years ago – something like the Great Flood, which is recorded in the racial memory of most ancient peoples? When we understand the cosmic scale of a worldwide event of this kind, and its repercussions, it becomes evident that conditions soon after the Flood would hasten the ice build-up and thus *reduce the above time span*.

In the aftermath of such a Great Disaster,

1. Large areas of the oceans and seas would have boiled and steamed.

2. Large quantities of stranded water filled all low continental areas.

3. Volcanic activity evaporated enormous quantities of water into steam clouds. This inevitably resulted in the formation of thickening cloud cover.

4. The general release of heat, smoke and dust initiated
atmospheric pollution that would last for decades. And the sheer weight of this polluted atmosphere would have forced the cloud base down to unprecedented low levels.

5. The dust reduced solar-radiation and lowered temperatures. Much of the high latitudes of Earth were enveloped in a gloomy shroud.

6. The cold air and warm oceans caused heavy precipitation of snow.

7. Falling again and again in a sunless world, the snow finally cooled the ground to the point where it could turn to ice.

Based on evidence alone, it is beyond reasonable doubt that this one and only Ice Age was short-lived. (Concerning the cause, timing and duration, of the Ice Age, you are invited to study carefully Appendix 1.)

Assumptions of long periods of glaciation are not provable by dating methods, states Frederick Johnson, writing with Willard Libby, the most recognised authority on carbon dating. (Willard F. Libby, Radiocarbon Dating. 1955, p.148)

De Lapparent likewise “concluded that the entire Ice Age was of very short duration.” (Immanual Velikovsky, Earth in Upheaval. London: Sphere Books, Ltd., 1978, p.143)

Researchers Suess and Rubin were driven to a similar conclusion that in the mountains of the western United States ice advanced only 3,000 years ago.

According to the latest evidence, glaciers may NOT even need thousands of years to build up, nor to disintegrate.
New Zealand’s Tasman Glacier, for example, is dying within our lifetime.

Brent Shears runs his Glacier Explorers cruise on a lake which didn’t even exist when he was born. Lake Tasman, the result of the melting of the Tasman Glacier, is not much more than 20 years old. As the glacier recedes, at an ever-increasing rate, it is leaving in its wake the body of water now known as Lake Tasman.

Visiting the site, Stephen Lacey writes of

…the creaks and groans of melting and movement. It strikes me that what I can hear is the death throes of the glacier as it drags its body back up the valley…its long claws ripping and tearing at the ground like a great wounded beast. Suddenly I hear a sound like an express train, roaring through a tunnel.

All heads turn towards the direction of the noise, just in time to see a huge chunk of ice break away from the glacial wall and plunge 10 metres into the lake. The splash sends a shock wave through the water and the boat rocks steadily. I realise that the crippled glacier is a whole lot more dynamic than the cold white photos in our high school geography books.

‘That was a serac fall,’ Brent says. ‘It was only a small one…I’ve seen them the size of houses.’ (“The Big Thaw”, Panorama Inflight Magazine)

The Tasman Glacier is retreating at an estimated 80 metres every year. Lake Tasman is already six kilometres long and growing.

Over the years, on the glaciers around Mount Cook (including Tasman), one hundred people have vanished into crevasses and other spots. Now, as the glaciers retreat, bodies are appearing in the terminals.
In 1998, research by a team at the University of Colorado, in Boulder, revealed that mountain glaciers all over the world are in retreat.

The European Alps have lost about 50 percent of their ice in the past century, while 14 of 27 glaciers that existed in Spain in 1980 have disappeared. In Africa, the largest glacier on Mount Kenya has shrunk by 8 percent in the past 100 years, while those on Mount Kilimanjaro are only 25 percent as big. (Charles Arthur, in an article in The Independent, U.K., June 8, 1999)

Growth and retreat of glaciers is a rapid thing. It does not take vast ages.

But the bottom line is this. Numerous glaciers are no older than 4,000 years. Why is this? What happened around 2000 BC to spawn the world’s glaciers? That’s what we need to ask.
INLAND LAKES - c.4,000 YEARS

Present desert areas around the world show evidence of recent water bodies (Jonathan Gray, *The Corpse Came Back*, chapter 20).

Studies of salt and mineral deposits in numerous glacial lakes that have no outlet to the ocean suggest that none of them is older than 4,000 years. This is based on concentration, area, water composition and evaporation rate. (Velikovsky, *Earth in Upheaval*, pp.148-150)

These lakes formed as the result of melting ice.

A study by Claude Jones of the lakes of the Great Basin (from larger glacial lakes) showed that these lakes have existed only about 3,500 years. Van Winkle obtained the same result on Albert and Summer lakes in Oregon, and also Gales on Owen Lake in California.

The end of the Ice Age, therefore, as well as the remains of prehistoric animals found in the lake deposits, apparently goes back no more than 40 centuries ago.
Lake Agassiz, the largest glacial lake in North America, was formed when the ice of North America melted. Study of its sediments shows that its total life span was only a few hundred years.

The American glaciologist Warren Upham expressed surprise at the “geological suddenness of the final melting of the ice-sheet, proved by the brevity of existence of its attendant glacial lakes.” (Warren Upham, *The Glacial Lake Agassiz*. 1895, p.240)

Erosion on the shores of Lake Agassiz and the condition of residue indicate that this great change took place no longer than “a few thousand years at the most.” (Ibid., p.239)

Inland lakes and seas - none of them is older than 4,000 years.

My question is: Why do they go back no earlier than about 2000 BC? What happened around 4,000 years ago to start them off?

**RIVER DELTAS - 3,600 to 5,000 YEARS**

The deltas of the Nile, the Volga and the Mississippi are all essentially alike and could be of about the same age.

The beginnings of these deltas were made by the enormous rivers whose old high terraces we see far above the present channels.

The Mississippi River brings down mud at the rate of 80,000 tons an hour. From an evaluation of the debris borne to the Mississippi delta as sediment, two scientists, Humphries and Abbot, in 1861, calculated the delta to be 5,000 years old.

Of course, excessive water flow during the early post-Flood centuries would **reduce this time span.**
On the Alaska - British Columbia border is the Bear River, a stream still fed by a melting glacier that enters the Portland Canal.

Concerning the Bear River delta, Immanuel Velikovsky notes:

“On the basis of three earlier accurate surveys made between the years 1909 and 1927, G. Hanson in 1934 calculated with great exactness the annual growth of the delta through deposited sediment. At the present rate of sedimentation the delta is estimated to be ‘only 3600 years old.’” (Velikovsky, p.145)

Once again, we have same approximate time frame as for the glaciers and the inland seas. None of them is older than 3,600 to 5,000 years. And, as noted above, excessive water flow in the past would reduce the higher time span.

My question is: Why do they go back no earlier than about 2000 BC? What happened around 4,000 years ago to start them off?

**WATERFALLS - c.4,000 YEARS**

Rarely has a waterfall either deepened its bed at the top of the falls or shown more than slight erosion into the cliffs. This is evidence of “newness”.

We stand in awe before the mighty Niagara, deafened by the roar of its spectacular plunge. And we say, “What power!”

The rate at which the Niagara Falls are moving upstream indicates that they are no more than a few thousand years old. The rim of the falls has been wearing back from its original precipice to form a gorge.

Examination of records shows that since 1764, the falls cut the gorge from Lake Ontario toward Lake Erie at the rate of 5 feet
per year. If this wearing down of the rock has continued always at the same rate, 7,000 years would have been sufficient to do the work.

However, closer to the Flood, erosion was much more rapid. Therefore the age of the gorge must be considerably younger.

G.F. Flint of Yale, noting “the present rate of recession of the Horseshoe Falls to be, not five feet, but rather 3.8 feet, per year,” calculated the age of the Upper Great Gorge, the uppermost segment of the whole gorge, to be “somewhat more than four thousand years.” (Flint, p.382)

Careful investigation by another scientist, W.A. Johnston, of the Niagara River bed, disclosed that the present channel was cut by the falls less than 4,000 years ago. (Velikovsky, p.176)

Do you see? There’s that figure again. Once again, we have same approximate time frame for the glaciers, inland seas, river deltas, and waterfalls. None of them is older than about 4,000 years.

My question is: Why do they go back no earlier than about 2000 BC? What happened around 4,000 years ago to start them off?

**CORAL REEFS - c.4,000 YEARS**

Drill samples have confirmed coral reefs to be growing like tree rings.

The Great Barrier Reef in Queensland, Australia, is the world's largest reef system. It comprises over 2,900 individual reefs and 900 islands, stretching for over 1,600 miles (2,600 kilometres) over an area of about 133,000 square miles (344,400 square kilometres).
The Great Barrier Reef can be seen from outer space. In fact, it is the world's biggest single structure made by living organisms.

To study it, let’s zero in on one section - the Pandora Reef. Scientists from the Australian Institute of Marine Science at Cape Ferguson, south of Townsville discovered that it had grown 15.3 mm (c. ½ inch) per year in 118 years. (Peter Isdale, scientist of A.I.M.S., reported his findings in *Nature*, vol.310, 16 August, 1984, pp.578-579)

On this basis the whole 10 metre (32½ foot) thickness of coral that makes up this reef would have taken only about 660 years to grow!

Previously measured growth rates for massive coral colonies elsewhere on the Great Barrier Reef are from 5 mm to 25 mm per year. At their thickest part (at the edge of the continental shelf), the outer ‘barrier’ reefs are about 55 metres (180 feet) thick.

On the basis of an average growth rate of ½ inch per year, the Great Barrier Reef can be no older than 4,340 years. (At 15 mm per year it would be less than 3,700 years old.

Uncanny, isn’t it? Once again, we have same approximate time frame for the glaciers, inland seas, river deltas, waterfalls and coral reefs. No confirmed age is older than about 4,000 years.

My question is: Why do they go back no earlier than about 2000 BC? What happened around 4,000 years ago to start them off?

**TREES - c.4,000 YEARS**

Today’s oldest living things date to the same general time frame.
**Sequoia:** Some believe that these monsters may enjoy perpetual life, since they seem to be immune to disease and pest attack. Many are over 3,000 years old.

A remarkable fact is that these still-living trees seem to be the original trees in their present stands. There is no evidence of older generations of trees growing before them.

Edmund Schulmann, writing in *Science*, asks:

“Does this mean that shortly preceding 3275 years ago (or 4000 years ago, if John Muir's somewhat doubtful count was correct) all the then living giant sequoias were wiped out by some catastrophe?” (Edmund Schulmann, “Longevity Under Adversity in Conifers”, *Science*, vol.119, March 26, 1934, p.399)

**Kauri:** Late in the 19th century, on New Zealand’s Coromandel Peninsula, a giant kauri was felled. This lordly tree, measuring 76 feet (23.4 metres) in girth and 80 feet (24.6 metres) to the first limb, was discovered in the Mill Creek area, north-east of Thames. It was thousands of years old and still alive - when ruthlessly felled. Legend is that the stump thereafter supported a dance band and a goodly group of dancers.

How old was such a giant tree? Although estimates varied, the maximum age of this “oldest of all living kauris”, was declared to be “over 4,000 years.” (A.H. Reed, *The New Story of the Kauri*. Wellington, NZ.: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1964, p.44)

**Bristlecone pine:** The oldest bristlecone pine “began growing more than 4,600 years ago,” according to Schulmann. (Schulmann, “Bristlecone Pine, Oldest Living Thing”, *National Geographic*, vol.113, March, 1958, p.355)

Whitcomb and Morris comment:

Since these, as well as the sequoias and other ancient trees, are still living, it is pertinent to ask why these oldest living things apparently have had time to develop only one generation since they acquired their present stands at some time after the Deluge.
There is no record of a tree, or any other living thing, being older than any reasonable date for the Deluge.” (John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1986, p.393)

In regard to the 4,600 year figure for the oldest bristlecone pine, it should be stated that tree-ring measurement is not entirely satisfactory. In irregular years there can be two rainy seasons, and this would produce two rings instead of one.

Dr. Clifford Wilson summarises the position rather well:

In fact, under certain conditions a tree may demonstrate more than two rings in a year. Three is not uncommon, as with a tree that grows on a slope. If the water supply runs off rapidly it sometimes gives an artificial wet and dry period three or more times in a year. There are even cases where the opposite sides of a tree have exhibited different numbers of rings. (Clifford Wilson, *The Chariots Still Crash*. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell and Co., 1976, pp.53,54)

Once again, we have same approximate time frame as for the glaciers, inland seas, river deltas, waterfalls and coral reefs. No confirmed age is older than about 4,000 years.

Trees on both sides of the world are up to about the same age. My question is: Why do they go back no earlier than about 2000 BC? What happened around 4,000 years ago to start them off?

Taking this into account, the oldest bristlecone pines reflect fairly closely the date of the Great Flood, after which trees began once more to take root around the planet.

**OLDEST DESERT - c.4,000 YEARS**

The Sahara Desert has what’s called a prevailing wind pattern (meaning, the wind usually blows the same way). And this creates a problem. The hot air blowing off the desert “cooks”
the trees at the edge and they die. Then that area also becomes desert. (The process is called desertification.)

In 1999 it was announced that the Sahara Desert is about 4,000 years old. This figure was based on desert growth patterns, rate of growth, and so on. (Potsdam Institute for Climate Research, in Germany, July 15, 1999. *Geophysical Research Letters*)

Now, this does raise a question. If the earth is billions of years old, shouldn’t there be a bigger desert some place? Why is the biggest desert on earth only 4,000 years old?

Once again, we have same approximate time frame for the glaciers, inland seas, river deltas, waterfalls, coral reefs and the oldest trees on earth. No confirmed age of the deserts is older than about 4,000 years.

We ask again: What do they go back no earlier than about 2000 BC? What happened around 4000 years ago to start them off?

Just suppose that there was a cosmic cataclysm such as a worldwide Flood some 4,355 years ago? It’s pretty hard to have a desert under a flood, right? In any case, the biggest desert should be – and is – less than 4,355 years old!

**OTHER NATURAL FEATURES**

You may be wondering, What about magnetic reversals, and the time it must take to produce varves, coal, canyons, dense jungles, and rock strata and fossils, and so on? Though these could be dealt with here, I shall resist the temptation to do so, since these are already covered in my book *The Great Dating Blunder.* (<http://www.beforeus.com/shopcart_ebooks.html>)
AXIS RECOVERY - c.4,355 YEARS

We have been hinting at a worldwide disaster that interrupted history.

A sudden displacement of the earth’s axis would cause the destruction of the entire surface of the planet.

This sudden change in position would leave the earth wobbling like a disturbed top – and the earth is indeed WOBBLING on its axis today.

South Australian government astronomer George F. Dodwell made an interesting discovery in relation to the earth’s wobble.

Dodwell served in the South Australian Observatory for 53½ years and was South Australian Government Astronomer for 43 years. His work, which gained worldwide recognition, is commemorated by a plaque on the site of the old observatory on West Terrace, Adelaide. (<http://adsabs.harvard.edu/full/1964QJRAS...5...55.>)

Dodwell investigated what astronomers call “the secular variation of the obliquity of the ecliptic”. He did an investigation of summer solstice studies at ancient sites, such as Stonehenge, Amen Ra, Edoxus, and so on. Put simply, he studied measurements of the sun’s shadow-length by ancient astronomers from five continents. Available records of the position of the sun at observed solstices showed that an exponential curve of recovery had taken place in relation to the earth’s axis.

In late 1960, he wrote to Dr. Arthur J. Brandenberger, professor of photogrammetry at Ohio State University. Dodwell stated:

I have been making during the last 26 years an extensive investigation of what we know in astronomy as the secular variation of the obliquity of the ecliptic, and from a study of the available ancient observations of the position of the
sun at the solstices during the last thousand years, I find a curve which, after allowing for all known changes, shows a typical exponential curve of recovery of the earth’s axis after a sudden change from a former nearly vertical position to an inclination of 26½ degrees, from which it was returned to an equilibrium at the present inclination of 23½ degrees during the interval of the succeeding 3,194 years to A.D. 1850.

That is to say, the earth’s axis had once been almost upright, but it had suddenly changed to a 26½ degrees tilt, from which it had been wobbling back to its present mean tilt of 23½ degrees.

Dodwell’s research was confirmed by Dr. Rhodes W. Fairbridge of Columbia University, in *Science* Magazine, May 15, 1970.

Dodwell concluded that something “struck” the earth at that time. He realised that this would result in massive, worldwide flooding and catastrophic geological effects. The date of this event, from his curve of observations, is 2345 BC - about 4,355 years ago.

If you’ve heard anyone say that the earth has tipped over several times since then, don’t believe it. The evidence does not support such a claim. Furthermore, they haven’t heard of Dodwell’s findings.

The evidence shows a tipping of the axis in 2345 BC, followed by a measurable corrective wobble. There is a clear pattern of recovery since 2345 BC that has not been disrupted.

(<http://www.setterfield.org/Dodwell_Manuscript_1.html>)

This points to a disaster of devastating worldwide proportions in 2345 BC, from which all the processes of nature have since been recovering.
SOMETHING ENORMOUS OCCURRED 4,000+ YEARS AGO

According to these eight independent physical witnesses, something significant did occur to the natural features of our planet, which brought a clean break, then set everything going again, around 4,000 years ago.

Here is an amazing synchronisation of natural time clocks!

The inference from all of these is that every natural process had a new beginning after a massive worldwide cataclysm.

![Diagram showing natural phenomena that occurred around 4,000 years ago]

We have the same approximate dating from all parts of the planet. More importantly, it comes from all types of clocks, calculations and approaches.
THE GREAT DISASTER

Very well, then, is there solid evidence of such a world-shaking event? And I mean direct evidence?

Indeed there is. It is an event that cultures worldwide called the Great Flood, or the Deluge. If you didn’t know, it is the most widespread racial memory of mankind. The knowledge of it was handed down among all nations.

But, more importantly, there is an embarrassing wealth of physical evidence for a worldwide Flood.

The word “flood” does not convey to the modern mind what really happened on this occasion. This was not your ordinary type of flood.

It was an event which involved up to 30,000 volcanoes, earthquakes that ripped the crust of the earth apart on a world scale, then the whole continental land mass being worked and reworked, layer upon layer for over a year under water – in some localities with sediment being deposited up to 60,000 feet deep. In other words, not one square centimetre of the planet’s surface was left unchanged.

There are many good books available on the Great Flood. But I felt there was a need for a simply-written digest of the major evidence. Hence Surprise Witness. (<http://www.beforeus.com/second.php>)

In our present discussion you may occasionally see references to these two books, The Great Dating Blunder and Surprise Witness, which directly impact on our topic. In dealing with certain aspects of our topic, if copious evidence is not provided here, it is because it is adequately dealt with in these books. It must be stressed that one cannot under-estimate the cosmic scale of the Great Flood event. It totally destroyed every vestige of civilization, reshaping the land mass of the whole planet.
In *Surprise Witness*, the following aspects of this event are covered:

**THE STAMPEDE**
- Fossil evidence of men, women, children and animals fleeing.
- Animals and birds racing to thousands of hills all over the world. Why?
- What drove strange mixtures of animals that don’t normally live together – into caves and crevices all over the world? And buried them together?
- What brought arctic and tropical animals to the same mountain top? Why are deep sea creatures found high up in the Himalayan mountains?

**A GLOBAL FLOOD** – one of the pivot events of history.
- 2 billion people, with their astonishing technology, vanish. A crack rips around the earth at 2 ½ miles a second. Jets of water shoot 70 miles high… a thermonuclear meltdown… 30,000 volcanoes erupt… the planet’s thermal canopy collapses.
- Waves 700 feet higher than New York’s Empire State Building sweep the globe.
- The earth’s surface is churned up thousands of feet deep. Floods of lava.
- Where did all the water come from? Where did it go? How did it cover the mountains?

**EVOLUTION ENIGMAS and COVER-UPS**
- What find has scared paleontologists out of their wits?
- Lies, cover-ups and deceit in the scientific world … evidence destroyed. Why?
• The great interpretative blunder regarding the earth’s strata.

The above aspects are listed here simply to stimulate your thinking. I shall say this again. The Great Flood was not some puny local event, but an earth-restructuring cataclysm in which seas and continents were churned up together. It lasted more than a year. It entirely destroyed one world and began another. It brought a total break in world history.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Today’s deserts, ice, and other topographic features, came into being as a consequence of the Great Flood.

2. There is NO evidence for an earlier date for the Flood. There is NO evidence for a global disaster in 5000 BC, 10,000 BC or any earlier date. None at all!

3. No civilization that existed before the Great Flood – before 2345 BC - has survived to continue its history.

There can be no question that the Great Flood reset our dating processes. It marked a clear break in history.

Do I hear an objector? My response is this: If you haven’t bothered to study Surprise Witness and The Great Dating Blunder, then don’t waste my time talking about things of which you know virtually nothing. Come back to me when you know the facts.

ONE FLOOD OR MANY LOCAL FLOODS?

The question may arise, Could today’s earth’s features be the result of numerous smaller floods rather than one great event?
Not really. You see, a series of local floods could not have produced the enormous size of some features seen today in the earth’s crust. Only a global involving water can adequately explain all the geological phenomena. (I deal with this question in more detail, with examples, in Surprise Witness, chapter 10.) To explain the evidence of enormous worldwide devastation and earth changes, one major cataclysm is quite adequate. We do not need to speculate more than one. What we see here is evidence of one Global Flood, but with many smaller, but significant, upheavals in the centuries since.

It is not our purpose to go into detailed evidence for that here. Sufficient to state that the Great Flood is supported by evidence more abundant than that for any other event in history.

Before dismissing this, the skeptic is challenged to thoughtfully examine the evidence presented in Surprise Witness, which was published especially to provide an easy digest of the massive body of global Flood evidence. (<http://www.beforeus.com/second.php>)

May I suggest to you that when all evidence is in, the intelligent, unbiased researcher should have little trouble in seeing that the legendary Flood survivor Noah is no myth, but a real historical person.

And the dating probability inferred from the natural processes covered in this chapter is reduced to a matter of certainty by Dodwell’s discovery.

Well, I suppose such a conclusion puts me in the ranks of the nutters.

Are you ready for what’s next? Here it comes…
DATING OF MAYA & TOLTECS

Recently an email came in, asking if the Maya civilization began in 3114. After all, that was the date their calendar began.

A reasonable question.

A MAYA CIVILIZATION AS EARLY AS 3114 BC?

According to the Mayan Long Count calendar, our solar system is nearing the end of the 5,125 year “Great Cycle”, extending from 3114 BC to 2012 AD.

There is no evidence that the Maya started recording time in 3114 BC. That is the date when their calendar is supposed to have begun, but the first confirmed calendric inscriptions do not appear much before 500 BC.

It appears that from studying the movements of heavenly bodies, the Maya calculated that there would occur a conjunction of the sun, the ecliptic and the Milky Way in 2012. Such a milestone would appropriately end a natural astronomical cycle. From this calculated future event, they then extrapolated back to 3114 BC as the starting point of a calendric cycle.

Although many interpretations of the “end date” of the Mayan 13-stage Long Count calendar exist (partly due to abbreviations
made by the Maya when referring to the date), some researchers use the Northern Hemisphere winter solstice date in 2012. This is a common interpretation of the calendar among New Age writers.

This solstice date is December 21, 2012. Then the Long Count calendar resets at year zero.

**WHY CHOOSE THAT ENDING DATE?**

You may wonder, why would the Maya choose that date for the ending of their Long Count calendar? What is so special about December 21, in 2012?

Put simply, at that time there is a galactic eclipse in which the sun appears to be in the centre of the Milky Way. And the entire Milky Way is spread out over the sky with every part of it visible.

To understand what is so special (astronomically) about December 21, in 2012, five things should be noted:

1. Our solar system is part of the Milky Way galaxy. The Milky Way band cuts across our star charts. The exact centre of this Milky Way band is known as the “Galactic Equator” (not to be confused with the Galactic Centre).

2. If the stars could be seen in daytime, the sun, moon and planets in the course of one year would appear to move through a belt of constellations about 16 degrees wide, encircling the earth. This apparent path of the sun is called the *ecliptic*.

3. In the chart below, both the Milky Way (crossing at an angle from top to bottom) and the ecliptic (the dotted line crossing from right to left) are seen. Descending within the Milky Way is another dotted line. This is the Galactic Equator.
4. The precise point where the ecliptic crosses the Galactic Equator was known to the ancient Maya as “Crossroads”.

5. The chart below is a full view of the sky at noon on December 21, 2012. The sun traces a roughly horizontal path through the chart (the ecliptic). At noon on December 21, 2012, the sun, quite strikingly, is dead centre, sitting on the “Crossroads”.

This is the time when there will occur an extremely close conjunction of the winter solstice sun with the crossing point of Galactic Equator (equator of the Milky Way) and the ecliptic (apparent path of the sun).

Understand this, that the winter solstice sun rarely conjuncts the Crossroads. In fact, this is an event that has been approaching very slowly over thousands and thousands of years.
THE SPECULATION

For Mayan sky watchers, this long, slow approach of the winter solstice sun to the Crossroads could well have been seen as a critical process, the culmination of which was surely worthy of being called the end of a World Age.

From a simple observation of two successive worlds that they knew had already occurred in history (pre-Flood and post-Flood), something that was a FACT, they began to speculate beyond what they saw, until they had developed a theory of an unlimited succession of new worlds and their destructions.

Maya calendars reflected the Maya assumption that important events transpire at the end of a time cycle. One might use the analogy of the human gestation period, in which birth occurs at the end of that time period.

Similarly, it appears, the Maya incorporated ‘end-naming’ into their calendars. They named time-periods by their last day rather than their first day.

Thus the Maya fixed the Long Count calendar in real time by something they believed would happen on the end-date rather than the beginning date. This was an astronomical alignment. And so compelling and rare was the alignment that the ancient Maya astronomers believed it to signal the commencement of the next World Age.

BEGINNING OF THE CYCLE

You may ask, what about 3114 BC, the beginning of the Long Count?

On that occasion, the sun did align with the Crossroads, but not on the winter solstice (actually on Oct 10th, which is 72 degrees, or 1/5th of the ecliptic from the winter solstice).
It may be argued out that to predict an end-of-cycle destruction in 2012 is erroneous, since the previous cycle ending in 3114 BC did not bring world-wide destruction. Humans existed in 3000 BC.

However, modern defenders of the cyclic destruction theory will respond that the 5,125 year cycle is only part of a greater cycle. The full ecliptic is about five times longer. Known as the Great Year, Platonic year, or Equinoctial cycle, it corresponds to a complete revolution of the equinoxes around the ecliptic. Its length is about 25,625 years. Thus some postulate that a world-wide destruction occurred in the year 23,612 BC.

However, this remains no more than a philosophical speculation. It lacks evidence.

THE ASTRONOMICAL REALITY

Our solar system is located within a huge disc-shaped collection of stars and planets called the Milky Way. We're actually located close to the edge, slightly on top of the narrow disc. But very soon we'll be moving to the bottom of the disc. It is claimed that this change, from top to bottom, begins on December 21, 2012.

By coincidence, that is the same day that our Sun is at its solar maximum. And at that time the ecliptic of our solar system will intersect with the Galactic plane, called the "Galactic Equator" of the Milky Way!

Try to imagine the Milky Way as a pizza as large as a city – and our solar system as a bunch of peas on a plate, with a huge meatball in the centre.

Up till now, we have been drifting on the top of the pizza, never really able to see the bottom. The plate and pizza are not parallel. They are moving at different angles. We've been
drifting down, down, down... and on December 21, 2012, we will be exactly level with the crust -- forming an "x" at the Galactic Equator where galactic gravity is the strongest. After 2012, we will be passing through the bottom zone, viewing the Milky Way pizza from the South.

Such an alignment is very rare, occurring only once in the Earth’s precession cycle of 25.920 years.

Although the exact date is hard to determine, somewhere around the ending of the Maya calendar, the Earth, the Winter Solstice Sun and the galactic equator will align. As the alignment occurs the Sun will enter the Dark Rift of the Milky Way near the centre of our galaxy.

But, as pointed out earlier, there is no evidence that the Maya civilization began at the calculated start of this astronomical cycle of the solar system. We are speaking of two different things here:

1. The start of a natural cycle related to our solar system (which the Maya understood)
2. The origin of the Maya culture itself.

There is no link between the two. In other words, the Maya culture did not commence in 3114 BC. Not at all.

We shall have a clearer idea of the time that the Maya culture began, later in this chapter.

**WHAT THE TOLTECS REMEMBERED ABOUT HISTORY**

In the sixteenth century, the native Mexican chronicler, Ixtilxochitl in his *Relaciones* penned a history based on all available pre-Conquest records and legends, aided by his ability to understand the native tongue and decipher the hieroglyphics.

The history began with the creation of the world by the supreme god Tloque Nahuaque. This first era lasted 1,716 years, until floods swept over the earth. This is only a 60 year variation from the figure given in the King James Bible. *(Genesis chapter 5)*

**ONE LANGUAGE,**
**A SUDDEN CONFUSION,**
**THEN MIGRATION OUTWARD**

Ixtilxochitl records another ancient *Toltec* tradition that the descendants of the Flood survivors built a “zacuali” (tower) of great height. Everyone spoke the same language.

After this, their tongues became confused and, no longer able to understand one another, they went to different parts of the world. After some time, the seven families who spoke the Toltec language set out for the New World. They wandered 104 years over large extents of land and water. Finally they arrived at Huehue Tlapallan in the year One Flint, 520 years after the Flood.

Latest research places the date of the Flood at 2345-2344 BC, followed several generations later by a sudden breakup into many new languages, which resulted in the physical dispersion of the post-Flood population from a central point in the Middle East, at about 2244 BC.

And you may be assured, the facts of archaeology do not demand those dates to be earlier. Donovan Courville has shown this clearly. *(Donovan Courville, *The Exodus Problem*. Loma Linda, Ca.: Challenge Books, 1971)*
By the way, in case you imagine that the original one world language, the Babel tower incident and the sudden confusion of languages is just a myth, then you’d be well advised to think again. Archaeology has proven this to be another of the persistent racial memories of early mankind. It was indeed a real event. In fact, there is reason to believe that the remnants of the original tower of Babel still exist. (See my book, What Happened to the Tower of Babel?. Also The Weapon the Globalists Fear, chapter 7)

The word “confound” in the biblical account means to “mingle” or to “mix” – suggesting that man’s language was contaminated in a manner of speaking. In computer lingo we could say that a virus was introduced to make the software far less productive than it was originally designed to have been.

THE MAYA AGREE

The *Popul Vuh*, a book of the Central American Maya likewise refers to the original one language. It states that “those who gazed at the rising of the sun [the ancestors who formerly lived eastward of the Americas]... had but one language... before going west.”

In his book on the origin of the Maya, Votan declares himself a descendant of Imos, of the land of Chan, of the race of Chivim. Research shows that present-day Tripoli in Syria was anciently known as Chivim.

This was only 150 miles (240 kilometres) from the site of the Babel tower where the one language was suddenly split up into a confused mixture, generating a dispersion of the people.

A copy of Votan’s book, written in the Quiche language, existed until 1691, when it was very likely burned, along with other native relics, by the Spaniards at Huehuetan, but not before extracts had been copied from it. (H.H. Bancroft,. *Works of Bancroft*. San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft & Company, 1883, Vol.111, p.457)
THE GENERAL DATE

Independent calculations by the noted anthropologist linguist, Terrence Kaufmann, support this general period of time relating to languages in a remarkable manner. A study was undertaken in the language of the Maya of Central America. Norman Hammond reports:

It is accepted that all Maya languages derive from a single extinct ancestor, known as proto-Mayan, and the antiquity of this ancestor has been estimated by a technique known as glottochronology or lexicostatistics, developed and applied to Mesoamerican languages by the late Morris Swadesh. The basic assumption (not universally accepted by linguists) is that over a given period, say 1,000 years, all languages will change to approximately the same extent, in this case 14%: two languages of common parentage, separated for 1,000 years, will each have changed 14% of their vocabulary, and since the same words need not have been changed in each language, they will in fact share 74% of cognate, related words (74% being 86% of the 86% remaining unchanged in each language), according to the calculations of Terrence Kaufmann. Thus the Mayan language family began to break up from the common proto-Mayan before 2000 BC, and retains a common 26% - 35% of cognate words: the linguistic reconstruction suggests that the Maya came into existence as a separate entity more than four thousand years ago, and recent archaeological work not only confirms this, but indicates an even greater antiquity for the Maya as a cultural entity. (Norman Hammond, Ancient Maya Civilization. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1982, pp.92,93)

You will note that Kaufmann’s calculations took the language divergence back to “before 2000 BC”.

Quite independently, the noted archaeologist, Professor W.F. Albright, suggested that the Tower of Babel incident and the dispersion of the races (a story which he took seriously) should be dated to the 22nd century BC.
Interestingly, a surprising number of “new” civilisations that suddenly appear are dated to approximately 2000 BC!

As far as we know, there is no sign that any language spoken today has had a shorter history or a slower development than any other.

Again, the evidence shows the origin of the Mayan language as occurring not long before 2000 BC.
DATING OF CHINA

The credible, self-consistent history of ancient China dates from no earlier than 781 BC.

The period prior to that is unverifiable. Chinese literary records do, however, give dynastic epochs that are identical with dynastic epochs of the book of Genesis.

For example, it is told that a tremendous flood of devastating force occurred in approximately 2300 BC. The Chinese sacred book of the Shu-king tells of Fu-hi, who was “born of a rainbow” and bred and saved 7 kinds of animals to be used as a sacrifice.

The Epoch of Fu-hi began in 2944 BC (600 years before 2344 BC). From these details this is unmistakably speaking of Noah – even to the precise dates which we derive from the book of Genesis (2344 BC for the end of the global Flood). (Book of Shu-king, translated by W. Gom Old; also Genesis 7:2; 8:20; 7:6; D. Davidson and H. Aldersmith, The Great Pyramid: Its Divine Message. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., vol. I, 1936, pp. 438,439)

Notice the similarities to the Genesis record:

*The Bible*  
When Noah emerged from the Ark, God used a rainbow as a sign of his new covenant with the human race.  

*Book of Shu-king*  
Fu-hi was “born of a rainbow.”

(Genesis 9:13-17)
Noah saved 7 of each type of clean animal: from these he offered a sacrifice after the Flood. *Genesis 7:2; 8:20*

Fu-hi bred and saved 7 kinds of animals to be used as a sacrifice.

Noah was born 600 years before the Flood. *Genesis 7:6*

The Epoch of Fu-hi began in 2944 B.C. (600 years before 2344 B.C.)

The establishment of China’s first dynasty, the Xia dynasty in 2205 BC, marks the historical beginning of China’s 4,000 years of unbroken dynastic culture and civilization.

There is nothing in the high antiquity of China to conflict with the conclusion that some 200 years after the Deluge, Noah's descendants arrived in northwest China. (Martin Anstey, *The Romance of Bible Chronology*. London: Marshall Brothers Ltd., 1913, p.103)

In harmony with the histories of other nations, Chinese history pivots around a starting date of 2205 BC.

Are you following this? Before your head spins completely off your neck, let’s turn to some royal blood lines to clear it all up for us…
Did you know that a 710 year old copy of the Magna Carta was recently sold to a Washington businessman for 21.3 million dollars? According to *Wikipedia*, this is the most expensive document in the world.

What do you think is the value of five ancient, independently preserved royal family trees, each of which individually traces its origins, generation by generation, all the way back to Noah himself? What price would one of these fetch on the world market?

These are genealogies which survive from pagan, pre-Christian Iceland, Denmark, Ireland, Norway and Britain.

You see, certain people who migrated into Europe thousands of years ago kept an accurate record of their beginnings. They wrote down the names of their founding fathers and continually brought their genealogies up to date with each new generation.

And these preserved lists, annals and chronicles give us a surprising link between the early post-Flood era and more modern times.

During more than 25 years, British researcher Bill Cooper amassed copious evidence that the earliest Europeans recorded their descent from Noah through his son Japheth. They did this
in meticulously kept records. He investigated in detail these various records and was able to establish their antiquity and authenticity. (Bill Cooper, *After the Flood*, Chichester: New Wine Press, 1995)

Independent of any records kept in the Middle East, these pagan records originated in Europe. It is significant that they pre-date the arrival of Christianity in Europe. This nullifies any argument that they may have been medieval forgeries.

These records contain the early post-Flood history of Europe. They bear unsuspected and striking marks of authenticity – and contain certain material that can be dated to at least the 12th century BC – with important details of which no later forger would have been aware.

We have, for example, the genealogies and king lists of ancient Britain. These commence before the migration of their ancestors into Europe. These ancestors of the early British kings were counted generation by generation, back all the way to *Japheth*, one of the sons of Noah.

Cooper researched the lists of six separate Anglo-Saxon royal families whose kingdoms were hundreds of miles apart, who spoke different dialects and whose people rarely wandered beyond their own borders unless it was to fight. He discovered that each had a list of ancestral names that just happens to coincide in its first five names with that of every other.

And each goes back to Japheth, the ancestor of the Indo European races. For example, “This *Sceaf* [Japheth] was Noah’s son, and he was born in the Ark.” (*Reliq. Antiq.*, p.173)

These pre-migration ancestral lists of the Anglo-Saxon kings would be astonishing records even if they were the only ones that existed. But, in addition, separate genealogies were kept by the pre-Christian Danes, Norwegians and Icelanders. And the genealogies of these diverse nations, in their earlier portions, though strictly individual, are practically identical.
AGREED: THE DISPERSION AFTER 5 GENERATIONS

Now, here’s the interesting part. When we compare the genealogies of these diverse nations, the early Irish, the Anglo-Saxons, Norwegians, Danes and Icelanders, we discover that up to the FIFTH generation they share the same ancestral names.

That is, the genealogies show a unity as a single people, up to the FIFTH generation. But from generation FIVE the pedigrees diverge. And this is remarkable!

Why? Because what we discover in these isolated pagan European histories is precisely the history we also find in the book of Genesis from the Middle East – that the people were one, until the Babel event. And that this occurred during the FIFTH generation after the Flood.

From that moment in time – the FIFTH generation after the Flood – the pedigrees of these five nations branched away from each other in an emphatic way.

It astonished me to discover that the diverse genealogies of these five separate nations are exactly in accordance with the post-Babel dispersion of nations as depicted in Genesis.

Shem [son of Noah]… begat Arphaxad two years after the flood…. And Arphaxad begat Salah; and Salah begat Eber. And unto Eber were born two sons: the name of one was Peleg; for in his days was the earth divided. (Genesis 11:10 ; 10:24-25)

Here we see the five generations:

Shem > Arphaxad > Salah > Eber > Peleg

1  2  3  4  5
TWO DIFFERENT BRANCHES RECORDED INDEPENDENTLY - FROM JAPHETH

Something else of interest. Early in the Genesis Table of Nations we read:

The sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras. (Genesis 10:2)

Quite independently, we find the genealogy of the Irish Celtic kings tracing back to Japheth’s son Magog.

This descent through Magog in the early Irish chronicles is in direct contrast to the claims of the Saxons and other European nations, whose genealogies were traced back to Javan, another son of Japheth.

Modern archaeology has confirmed that the early Irish, the early British and some other Europeans were Celts.

But the Saxons were not Celts. These two groups were each from a different line – confirming what their genealogies show.

Quite independently of each other, the pagan Celts, the pagan Saxons and the Genesis record each separately supply cross-confirmation of each others’ history.

ACCURATE RECORDS KEPT

Someone may ask, were these ancient races really serious enough to keep accurate records over long periods of time? Let the historian and scholar M. F. Cusack answer:

The Books of Genealogies and Pedigrees form a most important element in Irish pagan history. For social and
political reasons, the Irish Celt preserved his genealogical tree with scrupulous precision. The rights of property and the governing power were transmitted with patriarchal exactitude on strict claims of primogeniture, which claims could only be refused under certain conditions defined by law… and in obedience to an ancient law, established long before the introduction of Christianity, all the provincial records, as well as those of the various chieftains, were required to be furnished every third year to the convocation at Tara, where they were compared and corrected. (M. F. Cusack, The Illustrated History of Ireland. 1868. Published in facsimile by Bracken Books, London, 1987)

It is impossible to see how anyone could have contrived even a minor alteration to their pedigree without every one else becoming immediately aware of the fact.

These records may be relied upon, therefore, to be as accurate as any record can be.

WORLDWIDE AGREEMENT

The skeptic is faced with this astonishing dilemma: that so many peoples from diverse cultures actually recorded their descent from post-Flood characters named in the biblical book of Genesis – and long before they could have heard of the Bible or have been taught its contents!

Here is a question for the skeptic who asserts that the biblical characters are fictitious. What knowledge could pagan Saxons (and all the other races) have had of supposedly non-existent biblical characters?

All of these sources differ from one another in many and various points – which rules out inter-dependency or copying. But they also agree on many independent points – which demonstrates the historicity of the records concerning the Genesis patriarchs who are listed.
To discover these biblical patriarchs listed amongst such diverse and independent sources – in all honesty, what should this tell us?

The historicity of many other characters from the ancient world is accepted on much less evidence than this – often merely upon the single appearance of a name.

It has been fashionable to fall for the evolutionists’ lie that you cannot take the Genesis account of our origins literally. However, these discoveries lay bare the great distortion. The truth is just now being glimpsed by a handful of specialists – it is still almost completely unsuspected by the average civilized citizen.

On the basis of the number of generations listed in the preserved genealogies, each genealogy – the Icelandic, Norwegian, Danish, Irish and British - would go back a little more than 4,000 years – within the same general time frame as the Great Flood.

Thus, these genealogies converge back to a point not long before 2000 BC, just as do the Egyptians, Sumerians, Maya and Chinese.

Here is an inescapable convergence of timing.

Denmark: 2000+ BC
Ireland: 2000+ BC
Britain: 2000+ BC
Norway: 2000+ BC
Iceland: 2000+ BC
EARLY IRISH GENEALOGY

(Bill Cooper)
ALL RACES LINKED BACK TO NOAH

If we are to believe the book of Genesis, those who emerged from the survival vessel at the end of the Great Flood to repopulate the earth, were eight in number – a man named Noah and his wife, and their three sons Japheth, Shem and Ham, with their wives.

Interestingly, in places as wide apart as South America, Europe, Africa and Asia, recorders preserved the names of their ancestors who survived the Flood. And, would you believe, these include names virtually identical to those in the Genesis account: Noah’s three sons Ham, Shem and Japheth.

THE NEW POST-FLOOD WORLD OFFICIALLY DIVIDED BY LOT

Many traditions of the ancient world state that sometime after the great World Flood, the earth was divided by lot among the three sons of Noah. Eusebius tells us that this solemn division took place about 20 years before Noah’s death. (George Stanley Faber, *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*. London: F. and C. Rivingtons, 1816, Vol. 3, pp. 467,468)

Each of the three groups had its own portion assigned to it for the future. Japheth and his descendants were to occupy initially Europe and northern Asia; Shem southern Asia intermingled
with Ham’s offspring, while Ham was to settle Africa and southern Asia.

Moses refers to this event in his writings. He says:

When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people. (Deuteronomy 32:8)

Among the nations, the remembrance of this triple division remained. Out of it, a certain territory, well-known to all the rest of mankind, was reserved as the lot of the future race through whom the promised world Deliverer would later come.

**INDIA:** There is an Indian account of the Great Flood. It says Noah (called Satyaurata) had three sons – Iyapeti (Japheth?), Sharma (Shem?) and C’harma (Ham?). To Iyapeti he allotted the regions north of the Himalayas and to Sharma the country of the south.

The father cursed C’harma, who had laughed at him when he was accidentally inebriated with strong liquor made from fermented rice. (*Institutes of Menu*, 1280 BC; J.H. Titcomb, “Ethnic Testimonies to the Pentateuch”, *Trans. Victorian Institute*, 6, 1872:249-253)

How strikingly close to the Genesis account of the cursing of Ham!

**GREECE:** Homer, in his *Iliad*, shows us that the Greeks likewise recollected three brothers. To each was given a domain when the world was divided. The Greeks trace themselves back to Japetos. (*Aristophanes, The Clouds*, Roger’s Trans., line 998); John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1930, p.196)

The Hindu Iyapeti and the Greek Japetos are recognisable as the biblical Japheth, son of Noah.
**CHINA:** The Chinese ancestor **Nu-Wah** (Noah) survived the destruction of the world by a flood and accomplished the reconstruction. There followed legendary heroes sometimes referred to as the Three Sovereigns (Noah’s three sons?). After these came the Three Dynasties, Hsia, Shang and Chou (held by scholars to initiate the historical period).

The Miautso people of China (who first settled in what is now Kiangsi province, until driven out by the Chinese) are another early people who regard themselves as being descended from Noah’s son **Japheth**. They also remember some of the other early patriarchs whose names appear in the biblical record.

When first contacted by the outside world, they were in possession of surprisingly accurate recollections of the Creation and the Great Flood. And some of the minute detail of their early world history matches almost hand in glove with the Genesis record.

The accuracy of their oral history owes its purity to the fact that it has been recited in full at weddings, funerals and other public occasions, since the earliest times.


Thus, in regions as far distant from each other as Greece, India, China, Britain, Ireland, Denmark, Norway and Iceland, the name of Japheth the son of Noah has been preserved, in agreement with the Hebrew book of Genesis.

This speaks loudly of an historical common point of origin after the Great Flood.

**ARMENIA:** Until early in the 20th century, when driven out by the Turks, the Armenians dwelt in the Ararat area of eastern
Turkey. The Armenians trace their ancestry to Hiak, the “Son of Targom [Togarmah], a grandson of Noah” (Moses Chorenensis, 1.4, sec.9-11) who is also named in Genesis 10:2,3. They claimed to have inhabited the Ararat region, the landing place of Noah’s survival vessel, since that time.

AFRICA: It is possible that all of Africa, despite the different shades of colour of its native populations, was initially settled by various members of the one Hamitic family. We find the Yoruba, who are black-skinned, claiming to be descendants of Nimrod, grandson of Noah. (K.C. Murray, “Nigerian Bronzes: Work from Ife,” Antiquity, England, March, 1941, p. 76; compare Genesis 10:8)

The Libyans, who are white-skinned, are usually traced back to Lehabim, a son of Mizraim, son of Ham, son of Noah. (Compare with Genesis 10:13)

The Egyptians also were direct descendants of Mizraim. And the Arabs still call Egypt Mizr.

The Hottentots likewise speak of Noah, remembering him as Noh and Hiagnoh. The natives of the Sudan called him Nuh.

SOUTH AMERICA: In the Amazon region he was known as Noa.

PACIFIC OCEAN: In Hawaii he was remembered as Nu-u.

ALL NATIONS INCLUDED

Pulling back the curtain to see the bigger picture, the indications are that the descendants of Japheth divided into two major bodies. One of these comprised the ancestors of the Indians and Persians, whereas from the second there issued eventually the nations of Europe. Thus the word “Indo-European” sums up the group as a whole.
The descendants of Noah’s second son *Shem* comprised the Arabs, the Hebrews and the ancient Assyrians and Babylonians.

And from Noah’s third son Ham descended ultimately the Negroid and Mongoloid races, the so-called coloured races.

This dividing of the whole human race into three families in a way that does not concord with modern concepts of racial groupings, is not thereby discredited, but shown to be based upon a much clearer insight into the framework of history.

**ENOUGH TIME FOR RACES TO DEVELOP?**

It may be asked, If the world was wiped out, except for a single group of survivors, then however could all of today’s variations in the human race have occurred in just a few thousand years since that time?

What about the Australian Aborigines, for example, and the Chinese, and so on?

To be frank with you, I must confess that for ages I found this to be a tremendous problem for scientific acceptance of a Great Flood total wipe-out only 4-5,000 years ago.

That’s because I did not know enough about genetics.

Take *skin colour*, for example. Would it surprise you to learn that mankind has only one skin colour? That colour shows up as different shades in proportion to the *amount of melanin* in the skin. (Melanin is a colouring compound.)

Melanin protects our bodies by absorbing ultra-violet (UV) radiation from sunlight which falls on the skin.
Darker-skinned people have more melanin, which renders their skin more sunlight resistant. Thus they are better suited to hotter climates. Lighter-skinned people are better suited to a cooler environment.

**GOVERNED BY TWO PAIRS OF GENES**

John Mckay B.Sc. writes that “if a person from a pure white European background marries a person from a pure black Negro background, their children will be an intermediate brown colour. This brownish colour is called ‘mulatto’. If two MULATTOS marry, unlike their parents they DO NOT produce children which have the same colour. The offspring can be ANY OF NINE COLOURS, from pure white through to pure black.”

Thus “if we started today with one pair of middle-brown coloured people (similar to the mulattos), we could produce all the racial colours in the world, NOT IN MILLIONS OF YEARS, NOR IN THOUSANDS OF YEARS, BUT IN ONLY ONE GENERATION.” (John Mackay, *Ex Nihilo*, vol.6, no.4, May, 1984. Emphasis added)


**HOW IT WORKS**

A child receives half its genes from each parent. Let’s call these genes A and B. The genes have partners, a and b.

*Genes A and B* are good at producing melanin (which darkens the skin). Result: A person with two pairs of genes *AA and BB* will have *darker* skin.

*Genes a and b* both produce less melanin. Result: A person with two pairs of genes *aa and bb* will have *very light* skin.
A person with gene pairs $Aa$ and $Bb$ (let’s write it as $AaBb$) will have medium-coloured skin. And so on.

Now, *suppose both parents are AaBb* (medium-brown).

The mother gives the child two genes for skin colour – one from type $A$ or $a$, the other from $B$ or $b$. The father likewise gives two genes for skin colour – one from type $A$ or $a$, the other from $B$ or $b$.

So each of these middle-brown parents with $AaBb$ can give his/her children any one of the following pairs of gene combinations: $AB$, $Ab$, $aB$ or $ab$.

For example, suppose each parent passes on the $AB$ combination to the new child. The mother gives the child $AB$. The father gives the child $AB$. Result: The child will be born with $AABB$ – and thus will be *PURE BLACK*.

But if both parents pass on the $ab$ combination (the mother giving the child $ab$; the father giving the child $ab$), then what? Result: The child will be born with $aabb$ – and will be *PURE WHITE*.

… EVEN THOUGH BOTH PARENTS WERE MEDIUM-BROWN SKINNED!

**HOW COLOR BECOMES PERMANENT**

Notice that the PURE BLACK child is born $AABB$ – that is, he has *no genes for lightness*. If a group of pure black persons is isolated, their offspring will be only black. These children will have *lost* the ability to be “white”.

Likewise, when $aabb$ children marry their own type (pure white)
and move away to interbreed only among themselves, they will produce from now on only white offspring. They have lost their ability to be black. They no longer have genes to produce a great deal of melanin.

If we started today with just two MIDDLE-BROWN parents, they could produce extreme racial colours (BLACK and WHITE), in a way that races would have PERMANENTLY DIFFERENT colours.

A fixed middle-brown colour could also be produced. If the original middle-brown parents produce children of either $AAbb$ or $aaBB$ and these offspring move away and interact only with their kind, their descendants will be a fixed middle-brown colour.

**REVERSING THE PROCESS**

Despite marked differences, the races would disappear if total inter-marriage were practised today. There would reappear a brown coloured majority, with a sprinkling of every other shade permitted within the genetic pool.

The genes for Chinese almond eyes, black skin or white, etcetra, would still exist, but the combinations would be different.

Interestingly, you can find the characteristics of ANY race in EVERY race. For example, some Europeans have broad, flat noses, and others have short, frizzy hair, but on average Europeans do not have these features. The same sort of genetic recombinations that have produced skin colour variations have produced other body variations – straight hair, wavy hair, eye shape, eye colour, body height, and so on.

It may be of interest to note a comment by William C. Boyd,
Professor of Immunochemistry at the Boston University School of Medicine:

We should not be surprised if identical genes crop up in all corners of the earth, or if the over-all racial differences we detect prove to be small. We do not know the total number of gene differences which mark off a Negro of the Alur tribe in the Belgian Congo from a white native of Haderslev, Denmark. Glass has suggested that the number of gene differences even in such a case is probably small. Besides a few genes for skin colour, he thinks that there may be a dominant gene for kinky hair and a pair or two of genes for facial features. He considers it unlikely that there are more than six pairs of genes in which the white race differs characteristically from the black. This estimate errs somewhat on the small side, in the opinion of the present writer. Probably, however, it is of the right order of magnitude, and any outraged conviction that the difference between the two races must be much greater than this, which some persons might feel, is likely to be based on emotional, rather than rational, factors. (William C. Boyd (Professor of Immunochemistry at Boston School of Medicine), *Genetics and the Races of Men*. Blackwell’s Scientific Publications, p.200 ff)

**GENES FOR ALL RACES EXISTED AT THE START**

The first man was designed with the best possible combination of skin-colour genes for his perfect created environment.

The Great Disaster radically altered that environment.

Evidently, Noah’s family possessed genes for both light and dark skin, dark enough to protect them, yet light enough to ensure sufficient Vitamin D.
ALL RACIAL VARIETIES COULD APPEAR IN ONE GENERATION

From the above data it can be seen that all the known varieties of skin colour could come from one pair of mid-brown parents IN ONE GENERATION.

In general, racial characteristics are recombinations of pre-existing, created hereditary (genetic) information. They have not evolved and they do not require a long time to become apparent.

You can be clear on this. There has been no evolution of genes that did not previously exist. All that has occurred is the recombination and degeneration of created genetic information.

And the differences did not take countless ages to produce.

AFTER THE SEPARATION

It is now known from observation that

(a) a small population tend rapidly to vary to the utmost extent of their possible limits and then to remain stationary for an indefinite time.
(b) When a few members of it shift to a new environment, wide varieties again appear, which become stable only with time.

The splitting up of a large group into many smaller groups who became isolated from each other would provide the ideal condition for the RAPID APPEARANCE of many different racial groups with distinct characteristics.

This is doubtless what occurred. There is overwhelming
archaeological evidence for a common origin for all races on this planet. (Jonathan Gray, Dead Men's Secrets, pp.16-19. http://www.beforeus.com)

The scattering of mankind shortly after the Great Flood, when their language was suddenly confused, was the catalyst that produced the variations now seen.

Each of these groups migrated into areas which offered them new and different climates, as well as different diets from those they had been used to. As we noted, the global environment had drastically changed. From now on, it was unlikely that any two groups would find identical areas to move into.

So would such a change in climate, environment and diet have any effect on skin colours? Very little, actually. But there would be some effect.

Studies have been made on the relationship between skin colour and health or diet in a given environment. So we can postulate the following influences.

Those who, after the separation, moved to colder regions but had darker skin, could suffer from vitamin D deficiency, such as rickets. The Neanderthals are a classic example of this.

By the way, Neanderthals were not emerging primitives. That’s fiction. They had a skull capacity (with its inferred brain size) larger than that of modern man. Classic descriptions of so-called Neanderthal man were based in large part on the skeletal remains of a man suffering from severe osteoarthritis. He had degenerated. In fact, there are folk who would pass for Neanderthals, alive today. It has nothing to do with history or intelligence, but rather, health!

But back to our subject.

The skin, as you know, produces vitamin D from sunlight. So any person with a darker skin is worse off in a cold region,
because there is less sunlight. Because a dark skin is more sunlight resistant, it can produce less vitamin D.

So a colder environment, with less available sunlight (and not forgetting the available diet), would tend to favour those who inherited fairer skins.

Dark-skinned people in such an area would therefore tend to be less healthy and would have fewer children. This means that gradually the number of black people in any group going to a cold region would be outnumbered by the white.

Similarly, people with darker skins who went to sunnier or hotter regions would survive better – for one thing, getting less skin cancer. Gradually, the fairer persons would dwindle from the population and a black race would result.

I am aware that for racial, philosophical or emotional reasons, some person will disagree with what I have just revealed. But, if you put aside all prejudice and just investigate the scientific facts, you will discover that what you have just read is scientific reality. There is no avoiding it.

The bottom line is, today’s racial differences did not take countless ages to produce.
The evidence points to ALL races on the earth having descended from a common ancestor family group not much longer than 4,000 years ago. ALL races? yes, ALL races.

Of course, this will raise other questions. For example, why do people such as the Maya, the Egyptians and Sumerians speak of longer past ages?

And while we’re at it, what about the 9600 BC date for the destruction of Atlantis?

Yes, at first glance this dating question does appear a little thorny.

* * * * * * *

From the devastation of the Great Flood in 2345 to 2344 BC, let’s move forward a few centuries.

The new population multiplied fast and spread rapidly across the globe.

Within just two centuries after the Deluge, they had resettled in lands from northern Europe and Spain to Ethiopia and Iran.
However, those on the furthest fringes of the great migration found themselves, in their new environments, struggling to survive.

Post Flood pioneers continued to blaze trails and open up territories in every habitable part of the earth. At a basic level they made maximum use of the raw materials and resources of each locality.

This seems to have been done under pressure, since in a remarkably short time their descendants had established beachheads of settlement in every part of the world.

Wherever they went, they seem to have had a remarkable skill in adapting local raw materials for survival.

**FOCUSED ON PRACTICAL NEEDS**

Among the tribes descended from Ham were the Sumerians, the Egyptians and the American tribes, such as the Maya.

The Sumerians were an entirely practical people, with *no urge to search for truth for its own sake*. They sought for no underlying principles, and undertook no experiments for verification. (Samuel M. Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumer*. Indian Hills: Falcon’s Wing Press, 1956, pp. xviii, 6, 32, 58, 59) Their mathematics arose out of a practical need, that is, business records and transactions.


All the evidence goes to show that the Egyptians were severely practical. They sought to learn, not from any joy in the
attainment of truth for its own sake, but simply for solving everyday problems. (James Baikie, *The Story of the Pharaohs*. London: Black, 1908, p. 59) As practical men, they were *not given to abstract enquiries*.

The truth for its own sake, as an intellectual treasure, was *not* of greatest priority. It is important to understand this, when considering the length of history that each claimed.

For the Egyptians and Sumerians (both Hamitic nations), *keeping a strict record of their beginnings was not a practical need*.

And this can be said of the Hamitic nations in general, whether they be Oriental, American, or African.

**A MYTHOLOGICAL, EXAGGERATED HISTORY TOOK OVER**

Although they retained their national or tribal identities, even so, they soon lost all trace and memory of their own beginnings – and *went on to invent fantastic accounts of how they came to be*.

It’s amazing, but true. This mythological invention emerged early and grew rapidly in many cultures.

On the other hand, it should also be borne in mind that all the ancient kingdoms were fond of exaggerating their antiquity in competition with each other.

The Egyptians, to cite one example, extended their genealogies to absolutely incredible lengths. *National pride* led them to belittle their enemies and to *magnify their own age* upon earth.
Francis Hitching notes that

The Egyptian method was by adding up the number of years in the reigns of all their kings, as preserved in the king-lists; as several kings had reigned simultaneously in various parts of Egypt on many occasions, this totting-up led to wildly inaccurate figures; the Greek historian Herodotus, visiting Egypt a mere 150 years after Solon, was given by this method an authoritative date of 12,040 BC for the founding of Egyptian civilization.” (Francis Hitching, *The World Atlas of Mysteries*. London: Pan Books, Ltd., 1978, pp. 138-139)

Perhaps you weren’t aware of this before. It is a fact that their true histories were obscured beyond all recognition.

We find Josephus complaining that this had happened even to the Greeks of his day. And he lamented that by obscuring their own history, they had obscured the histories of other nations also. (Flavius Josephus, *Against Apion*. From *Josephus’s Complete Works*. Tr. William Whiston. Pickering and Inglis, 1981, pp.607-636)

THE MAYA CYCLES THEORY

The origin of the Maya theory of *long cycles* and the ‘*circle of the Destroyer*’ concept can be traced back to Mesopotamia around 2000 BC. (See my book *Stolen Identity*, chapter 14.) This was the centre from which the Maya and others later migrated.

From a simple observation of two successive worlds (pre-Flood and post-Flood), something that was a FACT, they began to *speculate beyond what they saw*, until they had developed a theory of an unlimited succession of new worlds and their destructions.
CONFUSED BLENDING OF FACT AND THEORY

These people inherited, along with all early civilizations, a scientific and technological culture, which included an accurate knowledge of astronomy.

As they later migrated into Asia, the Americas and elsewhere, they blended their scientific prowess with their philosophies - to juggle and refine their theories. One such theory that developed was the idea of cyclical destructions.

With their astronomical calendar, the Maya refined this idea to fit into their calendar. But, unlike their calendar, which was based on FACT and observation, ‘the circle of the Destroyer’ theory was based not upon observation nor from any evidence. It was no more than a philosophical theory.

Here was an imagined cosmic history, which was based not on evidence but on philosophy. We should be alert, and not allow ourselves to be taken in by something that is no more than a philosophical idea.

If you ever hear someone claiming that there has been a succession of total worldwide destructions, one after another, please do yourself a favour. Ask for the evidence. You will discover it does not exist. Nowhere will you ever find an atom of evidence for it. That idea is based on nothing more than some person’s philosophical mindset.

By contrast, the absolutely overwhelming physical evidence for the Great Flood overshadows all theories. It must take top precedence. Not only did the Great Flood reset our dating processes. It marked the only clear break in world history.
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DATING OF EGYPT

DATINGS OF OTHER NATIONS PEGGED TO EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY

It is universally agreed amongst reputable historians of antiquity, that Egyptian chronology is the yardstick by which the histories of the other nations are largely measured and brought into alignment with one another.

This being so, it is natural to ask, are the foundations of conventional Egyptian history able to sustain the elaborate structure being raised upon them?

The answer is a resounding NO!

EGYPTIAN DATES BEFORE THE FLOOD?

Now brace yourself for a shock. Our current conjectured history of Egypt is probably 600 to 800 years too long!

Some six to eight supposed “dynasties” never existed!

In case you didn’t know, inscriptions we dig up don’t carry a date, nor a ruler’s sequence number. It means we can easily get our dates wrong, even by hundreds of years.
The problem began in the early days of Egyptology. Modern archaeologists were giving highly exaggerated datings for the Egyptian dynasties. Dates like 6000 BC… 4000 BC.

So why were such older dates for Egypt accepted?

Simply because all the listed kings were placed one after another, in succession. This added thousands of extra years to Egyptian history. And at the time it seemed quite logical.

These lists of pharaohs had been provided by 3rd century BC Egyptian priest Manetho in his *Aegyptica*.

**MANETHO’S EXAGGERATED ERAS**

Herodotus vouches for the fact that at one time there were no fewer than 12 kings of Egypt reigning at the same time. However, Manetho made no allusion to this (Wilkinson, *Egyptians*, vol. I, p. 148), but rather made his Thinite, Memphite and Diospolitan dynasties of kings, and a long list of other dynasties, all successive!

The duration of all these dynasties, commencing with Menes, is so long, it passes all rational belief.

Virtually all of the ancient kingdoms were *fond of exaggerating their antiquity* in competition with each other. It has been suggested that Manetho, who recorded Egyptian king-lists, was probably in competition with the contemporary Babylonian historian Berosus to exaggerate the antiquity of their respective nations.

In Egypt the method was to add up the number of years in the reigns of all the kings on their lists (even though several kings had reigned simultaneously in different parts of Egypt) and tot them all up to wildly inaccurate figures.
So when the Greek historian Herodotus visited Egypt around 450 BC, he was given by this method an authoritative date of 12,040 BC for the founding of Egyptian civilization.

SCHOLARS IN CONFUSION

Fast forward to the early 20th century. Eduard Meyer of the Berlin School of Egyptology realised that the lists of pharaohs provided by the ancient chronologer Manetho were greatly exaggerated. It certainly did not correlate with the more precise information of the monuments. (E. Meyer, Aegyptische Chronologie, Philosophische und historische Abhandlungen der Koeniglich preussischen Akad. Der Wiss. Berlin, 1904)

The Egyptians did not keep clear records of eclipses and other astronomical events that could help in establishing a precise chronology.

But Meyer read that the Roman author, Censorinus (3rd century AD) had recorded that a Great Sothic Year had concluded in 140 AD. (Censorinus, De die Natali Liber ad Q. Caerellium, trans. D. Nisard. Paris: Hildesheim, 1965)

The Sothic Cycle was the number of years it took the star Sirius to pass from one heliacal rising (that is, first visible rising of the star before dawn) on New Year’s Day to another such rising. This cycle took 1460 years.

So with 140 AD as a starting point, Meyer calculated backwards (using multiples of 1460), and concluded that Sothic cycles must have commenced in 1320 BC, in 2780 BC and in 4240 BC. This latter date of 4240 BC, Meyer called the first fixed date in history of which one could be absolutely certain... based upon the notion (presumed from some Egyptian texts) that the ancient Egyptians counted time by the heliacal rising of the star Sirius.
UNIVERSITIES BEHIND THE TIMES

However, the most reliable archaeoastronomers today (for example, B. Schaeffer, “Predicting Heliacal risings and Settings”, *Sky and Telescope*, September, 1985, pp. 53-55; R. Purrington, “Heliacal Rising and Setting: Quantitative Aspects”, *Archaeoastronomy* No 12, JHA, xix, 1988, S72-75) have abandoned this theory, and the Egyptologists have abandoned Meyer’s date of 4240 BC in favour of another date, 3100 BC.

Despite this, it is Meyer’s Sothic chronology of Egypt, basically, that is still the one found in the text books of colleges and universities.

Meyer rearranged Manetho’s lists of Pharaohs according to the Sothic rule. It was thought that he had thereby created so mathematically precise a history of Egypt that Egyptologists still claim to be able to pinpoint the very day certain events occurred, back as far as the 15th century BC. They believe these events to be “astronomically fixed”.

The problem is that, whilst various Classical texts do make allusion to the Great Sothic Year, the Egyptian documents that refer to Sirius never do. The truth of the matter is that there is not the tiniest shred of evidence from Egypt to suggest that the Egyptians ever computed calendrically according to the Great Year of Sothis.

5 WAYS WE HAVE BEEN MISLED

Here are some facts of which early Egyptologists were not aware:

**Problem 1:**
Rulers were known by a title, as well as by a personal name. For example, it has now been discovered that Rameses II was not Rameses II, at all! He was most
probably Rameses XLII – that is, the 42nd ruler called Rameses, which was rather a title, like Pharaoh. (Charles V. Taylor, *Creation Ex Nihilo*, September-November, 1987, p.9)

So where a ruler’s title and name both appeared, Egyptologists had listed them separately, as though they were different pharaohs. Correcting this would shorten the list.

**Problem 2:**
Then it was discovered that pharaohs regularly had as many as five, and even more, names. The Egyptologists had taken these and listed them one after another. So, again, the chronology had to be shortened.

**Problem 3:**
It was also discovered that other listed pharaohs ruled at the same time over different parts of Egypt. *(Ibid.)* Rulers sometimes appointed others as co-regent during their lifetime. This means that two “names” ruled concurrently. Egyptologists have been adding many of these names on to a long list of what they thought were “consecutive” reigns.

What a mix-up! The dating was thrown into chaos. More shortening!

With such discoveries, the span of Egyptian history had to be progressively reduced. So that today it is commonly believed that Egyptian civilization began about 3000 BC.

Now take a deep breath. It turns out that even this is too long!

**Problem 4:**
To add fuel to the fire, linguistic expert and university lecturer Edo Nyland of Canada has recently decoded and translated some 120 of the pharaohs’ names. These appear in his book *Linguistic Archaeology*. In a personal
communication to the author, Ed reported:

“In doing my research I came upon some disturbing mistranslations by the ‘specialists’. I found two early pharaohs whose names could not possibly be correct, because instead of names, they were curses aimed at intruders to the tomb.

“When I pointed this out to an archaeologist, I was brushed off with: ‘All pharaohs' names have been properly translated, the book is closed on that subject’”.

Do you see? If some pharaohs were not really pharaohs at all, but merely curses…

More shortening of the chronology? Oh, boy! But that’s not all!

**Problem 5:**
Comparing documents on a generation-by-generation basis, Immanuel Velikovsky matched the history of Egypt with those of Babylon, Assyria, Israel, Greece and Persia, from roughly 1400 BC to about 330 BC.

His conclusion was startling: events of Egyptian history are described twice - and 600 years later they are repeated exactly, to the detail.

**BOYCOTT THREAT**

Velikovsky’s findings evoked an uproar.

His original publisher was threatened by astronomers and professors. They warned that if his books were published, there would be a boycott of the publisher's standard textbooks!
SO POPULAR HISTORY
IS TOO LONG

The mistake lies not with history, but with the historians. This has led to a mistaken increase in the total year count.

For example, the Great Pyramid construction is usually put at 2650 BC.

“SCHOLARS” SABOTAGE
ANCIENT DOCUMENTS

At this point the Turin Papyrus enters the picture. This ancient document was prepared during the late 18th Dynasty of the Pharaohs and included lists of all the kings of every dynasty of ancient Egypt through to the 18th Dynasty.

This papyrus was found during a temple excavation in the 19th century. The King of Sardinia carefully preserved it and entrusted it to some “scholars” at Turin for translation.

It arrived in perfect condition, but then something went wrong. The “scholars” destroyed or hid most of it. Why would scholars do that? Horror of horrors, it proved the “LONG dynastic” history of Egypt to be UNTRUE! So to “explain” the “changed condition” of the papyrus, they accused the King of Sardinia of sending it “unwrapped”.

The Palermo Stone contained a similar list. And while many “scholars” quote from “missing parts” of the stone, “unapproved researchers” can have access to only a few fragments. It is obvious that the stone was broken recently, since all inner edges of the fragments show recent fracture conditions.
OUR EGYPTIAN KNOWLEDGE IS MOSTLY GUESSWORK

W.B. Emery is one of the rare few who admit how limited our knowledge of ancient Egypt really is. He informs us that:

Unfortunately, our knowledge of the archaic hieroglyphs is so limited that reliable translation of these invaluable texts is at present beyond our power and we can only pick out odd words and groups which give us only the vaguest interpretations.” (W. B. Emery, *Archaic Egypt*. Penguin Books Reprint, 1984, p.59)

Yet, in most books we read, translations and conclusions are never stated as being theory; they are stated as firm fact.

DATING OF EARLY WORLD HISTORY IS IN CHAOS

The truth is, Egyptologists have been contracting the Egyptian chronology for decades.

For instance, down Bobbin Head Road in Turramurra, Sydney, Australia, stands a memorial in the bush. It is close to the gates of the park leading down to Bobbin Head – and within walking distance of the Lady Davidson Hospital, where after World War I wounded or gassed soldiers could recuperate.

One such soldier, Private Shirley, used to walk to this spot from the hospital. Out of a rock in the bush he carved a pyramid, sphinx and other objects, as a memorial to his friends who had served with him in Egypt - but never returned!

According to a plaque fixed at the spot, he completed his work in 1926, featuring “the Great Pyramid and Sphinx dating back to the 4th Dynasty in 4700 BC”. (A colleague of mine, Bruce Price of Sydney, has photos showing this date on the original
plaque.) However, by the time Bruce visited the park in 1996 - seventy years later - the date given for the 4th Dynasty was 2600 BC! The Egyptologists had themselves in seven decades contracted it by 2,100 years!

Okay, here is confession time. Until recently, the “experts” had me assuming that Egypt sprang up around 3000 BC (and likewise all the other civilizations of great antiquity).

And since these all emerged after the global Flood, then the dating for the Flood just had to be earlier.

How embarrassing! It now turns out that the scientific structure of Egyptian history is built on the framework of a mistaken chronology. The result of the artificial Sothic scheme is a vastly over-extended chronology of Egypt.

Such an Egyptian chronology, far from serving as a suitable gauge for the histories of other nations, only manages to throw one nation out of alignment with another. Due to this mis-alignment (especially for the period prior to the 9th century BC), archaeology is seldom able to bring face to face contemporaries from one nation to another right across the board.

This impediment of mis-alignment that the conventionally trained scholars have inherited has led them into trying all sorts of clumsy techniques to make their data fit.

Consider early Greek history, for example. In order to make the shorter Greek history align with the Sothic chronology of Egypt, archaeologists have found it necessary to insert into Greek history a so-called “Dark Age” of about 300 years (c. 1200 to 900 BC). And have inserted Dark Ages in many other places as well.

The painful fact is, there is absolutely no archaeological evidence for the existence of these Dark Ages. (Peter James, Centuries
And since Egyptian chronology is the rule and the standard for the entire world history, *the history of the entire ancient world* is consequently now in a most chaotic state.

Adjustments and revisions of Egyptian history will tend to considerably *shorten human history in general*.

**VAST AGES FROM ASTRONOMY ARE NOT Viable**

But, I hear someone ask, isn’t it possible to establish vast ages for some civilizations on the basis of astronomical data? Unfortunately, no - due to the disruptions to the earth’s axis in 2345 BC.

Any effort to construct a chronology earlier than that date on the basis of new moon, eclipse, or star observations, cannot be correct, because the order of nature was changed at that time.

Attempts to date the Sphinx and pyramids of Giza by astronomical alignments to, say 10,500 BC, are futile for the same reason.

This may come as a surprise, but neither are Egypt’s monuments much help in solving our dating dilemma.

This is because the monuments themselves do not begin their records before the 19th dynasty. As Anstey notes:

There was an older Egyptian Empire which may have come to an end about 1750 BC, and to it the pyramids belonged. But its duration can only be guessed. Canon Rawlinson thinks it may have lasted 500 years or so. This would bring us to **2250 BC**, as the date of the establishment of civilization in the form of a settled government in Egypt. (Martin
The Byzantine chronicler Constantinus Manasses wrote that the State of Egypt, as he knew it, had already lasted 1663 years. Counting backward from his day in 526 BC, which was the time when Cambyses, king of Persia, conquered Egypt, the Egyptian culture, according to Constantinus, was founded in 2188 BC, or about 56 years after the birth of Peleg.

About this time Menes led his colony into Egypt.

All authorities are agreed on this: however far we go back in the history of Egypt, there is no indication of any early period of savagery or barbarism there. Menes (the biblical Mizraim) came, dammed the waters and started building.

Yet some writers still play the old record – against mounting evidence – that Egypt is much older.

3 KEY NAMES

It may surprise you to learn that information concerning the founding of Egypt, as well as the approximate time frame for this event, can be known with some certainty.

Three key names upon which early Egyptian history pivots, are Khem, Menes and Hermes.

These are not fictitious characters, even though they were later deified by the superstitious Egyptians. They were real people who actually lived. And their names offer us clues to the founding of Egypt.
1. EGYPT = THE LAND OF HAM

Egypt was anciently known as the land of Khem. *Khem* (i.e. *Ham*), means “the burnt one” as in relation to the sun. Ham was reputed to be dark-skinned.

Some of Ham’s descendants peopled the continent of Africa. There are African tribes that still trace themselves back traditionally to *Ham*. For example, the *Yoruba* claim to be descendants of Nimrod, grandson of Ham. The *Libyans* are usually traced back to Lehabim, a son of Mizraim, son of Ham. And the *Egyptians* were direct descendants of that same Mizraim.

It appears that all of Africa, despite different shades of colour among its native populations, was initially settled by various members of this one Hamitic family.

Egypt was not only named for a member of Ham’s family, but, in fact, Khem (Ham) was in later ages openly worshipped in Egypt, in connection with the sun. (Bunsen, *Egypt*, vol. i. p.373)

The other two persons mentioned earlier - Menes and Hermes – were two of Ham’s sons.

EGYPT WAS COVERED BY WATER

Diodorus informs us that in earliest times “Egypt was said to have been not a country, but one universal sea.” (Diodorus Siculus, lib. iii. P.106) Plutarch also says that Egypt was sea. (*De Iside*, vol. ii. P.367)

Herodotus records that in the reign of the first king, “the whole of Egypt (except the province of Thebes) was an extended marsh. No part of that which is now situated beyond the lake
Moeris was to be seen, the distance between which lake and the sea is a journey of seven days.” (Herodotus, lib. ii. Cap.4)

Thus all of Lower Egypt was under water.

This prevalence of “water puddles” left behind on all the continents, as well as excessive rainfall in areas that are now desert, was an aftermath of the Great Flood that persisted for centuries. The China also recorded that when they first arrived, the land, largely soaked in water, had to be drained. Just as did Egypt. (A comprehensive report appears in my book The Corpse Came Back, chapter 20.)

In Egypt’s case there was an unrestrained flowing of the Nile, which “formerly washed the foot of the sandy mountains of the Libian chain.” (Wilkinson, Egyptians, vol. i. P.89) In fact, the Nile was called Ocean, or Sea. (Diodorus, lib. i. P.8)

Before Egypt could be fit for human abode it was indispensable to set bounds for the overflowing of this Sea (the River Nile).

2. MENES (MIZRAIM)
   “EMBANKS” THE NILE

When Menes led a colony into Lower Egypt and settled it there, he raised great embankments to enclose or confine its waters.

Hence this name was given him: Metzr-im (Mizraim) – which, among other things, signifies “The encloser or embanker of the sea”.

This is still the name which the Arabs (Egypt’s modern inhabitants) give to all of Egypt - Musr or Misr.

Names always tend to become abbreviated in the mouths of a people. Thus “the land of Misr” is simply “the land of the embanker”.
The “embanking of the sea (the enclosing of the Nile within certain bounds) was the making of it as a river, so far as Lower Egypt was concerned.

Thus a later king of Egypt (as the representative of Mizraim) was able to proudly boast, “My river is mine own, I have made it for myself.” (Ezekiel 29:3)

When we examine the doings of Menes (the first historical king of Egypt, according to Herodotus, Manetho and Diodorus), and compare what is said of him with this simple explanation of the name Mizraim, the result is illuminating.

Wilkinson describes the work which brought fame to that first king:

Having diverted the course of the Nile, which formerly washed the foot of the sandy mountains of the Lybian chain, he obliged it to run in the centre of the valley, nearly at an equal distance between the two parallel ridges of mountains which border it on the east and west; and built the city of Memphis in the bed of the ancient channel. This change was effected by constructing a dyke about a hundred stadia above the site of the projected city, whose lofty mounds and strong EMBANKMENTS turned the water to the eastward, and effectually CONFINED the river to its new bed. The dyke was carefully kept in repair by succeeding kings; and, even as late as the Persian invasion, a guard was always maintained there, to overlook the necessary repairs, and to watch over the state of the embankments. (Egyptians, vol. i. P.89)

Thus we see that Menes, the first acknowledged historical king of Egypt, accomplished the very achievement indicated by the name Mizraim. This strongly implies that Menes and Mizraim were simply names for the same person.
3. HERMES (CUSH) WAS FOUNDER OF EGYPT’S RELIGION

We are talking here about a powerful family in the early history of Egypt. While the royal dynasties commenced with Menes, one of his brothers set up the Egyptian religious system. (For more detailed information, see my book The Bizarre Origin of Egypt’s Ancient Gods.)

Evidence from the El Amarna tablets indicates that the Chaldean tongue was a diplomatic language in Egypt. “Her”, in Chaldee, is synonymous with “Ham”, or “Khem”, “the burnt one”.

It might be noted that the well-known Egyptian god HOR-us (identified with the sun) is the same as “Her” (“the hot or burning one”).

“Mes” is from “Mesheh” or “Mesh”, meaning “to draw forth”, or “to bring forth” (Bunsen, vol. i. Hieroglyphic Signs. Append., b.43. p.540), as applied to birth (Hislop, The Two Babylons, p.25)

Hence the familiar pharaonic name Ramesses means “the son of Ra” (or the sun); and Thoth-mes means “the son of Thoth”.

The point is that Her-mes simply means “the son of Her (Ham), “the burnt one”.

VERY CLEAR-CUT BEGINNINGS TO EGYPTIAN HISTORY

So here we have two brothers – sons of Ham – as prime movers in the establishment of the Egyptian nation.

If this conclusion is correct, then what becomes of the theory that Egypt was ruled by dynasties thousands of years before the reign of Menes?
It turns out that Menes, the first king, was none other than Mizraim, the grandson of Noah himself, who resettled the earth after the World Deluge.

And Hermes, the originator of Egyptian state worship, was none other than Cush, the father of the infamous Nimrod, ruler of Babel – and likewise a grandson of Noah!

For an understanding of the bizarre series of events that triggered Egypt’s rapid religious decline, see these two books:

*The Bizarre Origin of Egypt’s Ancient Gods*
http://www.beforeus.com/egyptgods.php

*Stolen Identity*
http://www.beforeus.com/stolen-id.php

Prior to its settlement, Egypt was uninhabitable. The waters of the Great Flood were still upon it.

The chronology of the book of Genesis sheds surprising light on this dark part of the history of the world. It informs us:

And the sons of Noah, that went forth out of the ark, were Shem, and *Ham* [“the burnt one”], and Japheth… And the sons of Ham; Cush, and *Mizraim* [“the encloser or embanker of the sea”], and Phut, and Canaan…. And Cush begat *Nimrod.*” (Genesis 9:18; 10:6,8)

Egypt 6000, 4700, or 3100 BC? The evidence says about 2200 BC. So much for the long chronology myth.
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DATING OF SPHINX

HOW OLD IS THE SPHINX – REALLY?

We have noted the origin of Egypt at around 2200 to 2100 BC, so it is appropriate that we address this question of the age of the Sphinx.

On the plateau of Giza west of Cairo, Egypt, sits the Great Sphinx of Giza, a statue 240 feet long, with a lion's body and a human head wearing the headdress of the Pharaohs.
THE EROSION WAS BY WATER

It is surrounded by desert sand. But it bears evidence of erosion.

Erosion by wind-borne sand? No. By WATER!

WAS IT FLOOD OR RAIN?

You ask, could the erosion have been caused by the Nile flooding and washing around the Sphinx at some remote time? The answer is that to erode the monument up to its neck would have required floods of twenty metres or more over the Nile Valley. No, if this was erosion by water, then it had to be rainwater.

The edges of the rock are rounded. And there are apparently deep fissures in the rock. The impressions on the stones are not horizontal, as would be caused by sand and wind (like the pyramids in the area); instead, they are vertical. This suggests that the Sphinx has been subjected to heavy rainfall.

The erosion is stronger on the upper parts of the Sphinx and its enclosure walls than around the base. This erosion of these “upper” surfaces exhibits a pattern of weathering commonly associated with exposure to rainwater run-off. There is a rolling and undulating vertical profile, with many vertical and sloping channels where joints in the bedrock have been opened up.

French scholar R. A. Schwaller, independent Egyptologist John West, and geologist Robert Schoch examined it.

Schoch contrasted this situation at the Sphinx with the state of weathering seen at other rock-cut features of the Giza Plateau. For example, in various Old Kingdom tombs, erosion by windblown sand has picked out areas of poorer quality rock, but has left the anciently cut facades and doorways not markedly
damaged. But the highly rounded weathering on the Sphinx and its enclosure indicates the action of rainwater over a long period.

**RAIN SO HEAVY!**

And do you know, there is good evidence that Egypt experienced very heavy rainfall in the earliest period. It is popularly assumed that there was a transition from ice age to the present desert environment between 10,000 and 3000 BC. And that rainfall then tapered off by about 2200 BC to its current level of about 20 cm per year.

**CONSTRUCTED 7000 BC?**

Two writers, West and Schoch, theorised that if we must go back as far as this popular view suggests, for sufficient rainfall to produce this erosion pattern on limestone, then the Sphinx must have been constructed either during or before this time. Say, perhaps, 7000 BC. If so, the Sphinx could be twice as old as “officially” claimed.

**OR 10,500 BC?**

Enter Robert Bauval and Graham Hancock. These two amateur archaeologists speculate an even earlier date. They suggest that the Sphinx was built not around 2500 BC... nor in 7000 BC... but in 10,500 BC.

According to their theory, star positions of the Belt of Orion and Leo the Lion, as arranged in the sky, are similar to the positions of the pyramids of Giza. And they believe that the time when the pyramids were in perfect alignment with the Belt of Orion was when it was at its lowest point, in 10,450 BC.
They believe the Sphinx was probably built during this time.

An attractive theory. But unfortunately, it is based upon certain assumptions which cannot be proved. The bottom line is that there is no unchallengeable evidence to support this date, 10,500 BC.

The problem is this. Calculation of former star alignments from a given location on earth depends on us knowing beyond doubt that either

(a) earth changes have not upset these alignments, or
(b) the precise extent of the earth changes and
(c) exactly when these changes took place.

As much as we might wish it to be otherwise, attempts to establish vast ages for civilizations on the basis of astronomical data, must fail - for the simple reason that the earth was violently tipped off its axis in 2345 BC. (See chapter 5 of this present work.) The locations of the stars as seen from every fixed point on earth were radically altered.

Sorry to be a spoil sport, but this tilting of the earth’s axis in 2345 BC plays havoc with the calculations that some people have made. Their mistake was to have not taken this event into account.

It is true that the calculation of the solar system’s progress through the heavens over thousands of years was not affected by the tilting of the earth’s axis. But the astronomical dating of earth features (by aligning a specific earth location with the stars) is quite a different matter.

In other words, you cannot count back using earth's present stability as a reference point. To claim so is wishful thinking. Unless you are Alice in Wonderland.
WHAT ABOUT 2000+ BC?

In rejecting both of the above theories (for 10,500 BC and 7000 BC), other scientists point out that:

1. There is no evidence of an Egyptian civilization so old.

2. Architectural evidence dates the Sphinx to around the same time as the nearby Pyramid of Khafra. And that pyramid may now be dated to 2144 BC. (See the next chapter.)

   (a) Khafra had four 26 foot long sphinxes constructed. Two were in front of each entrance to his Valley Temple. A drainage channel from the causeway to Khafra's pyramid empties into the Sphinx enclosure, which presumably would have desecrated the enclosure if it had already existed.

   (b) The centre court of the Sphinx Temple is identical to the centre court in Khafra's Mortuary Temple adjacent to his pyramid.

   (c) The core blocks of the Sphinx Temple match some of the strata of bedrock in the Sphinx enclosure and show that the temple was built as the enclosure was being excavated. It may be inferred that if other Khafra structures and the Sphinx Temple dated to the same time, then the excavation of the Sphinx itself dated to that time as well.

3. The Sphinx, a rapidly weathering structure, appears older than it is.

4. Subsurface water drainage (periodic wetting of the limestone by water-saturated sand) or Nile flooding could have produced the pattern of erosion. The water in the surrounding sand would have been drawn up to elevations
higher than flood levels due to capillary action. (The Sphinx and Valley Temples have been covered by sand for most of the time of their existence.)

5. There are thought to be two reasons why the erosion of the higher elevated Giza Pyramids is different from the erosion of the lower altitude Sphinx:

(a) The Nile floods were partly the source of the flood water filling the Sphinx enclosure (which is lower than the pyramids).

(b) If the Sphinx erosion was caused by rainfall 7000 BC and if the other structures in the Giza Plateau (built 4000 years ago) show normal wind based erosion, why didn't this later wind erosion destroy the sphinx’s “older” water-based weathering? (admittedly good logic!)

6. The Sphinx is believed by some to resemble Khafre, the pharaoh who built one of the nearby pyramids of Giza. He lived not very long before 2000 BC.

It has also been suggested that weathering on the Sphinx depends not so much on a great age, but rather on the properties of the rock itself. The middle layer of the Sphinx shows the most erosion because it is made of more porous limestone.

The pores of the rock being larger, they invite a process called “salt crystallization”. This occurs when morning moisture condenses on and in the rock, dissolving the natural salt present in the rock. During the day, this moisture evaporates. The salt crystallizes then presses against the pore walls. This process generally weakens the rock and enlarges pre-existing fissures.

When I first wrote about this, a reader asked, “But if it has all been buried under sand for most of its history, how much
morning dew could condense on the buried rock to allow the process to occur?"

A good question. Well, from my own observations underground at Sakkara, it appears that salt crystallization does not depend only on falling dew. It is coming through very fast now, all the way underground from the Nile River, particularly since the Aswan Dam was built. In fact, it is a growing danger to many of the old monuments.

**BUT WHY THE EROSION DIFFERENCE?**

Another question that arises is this: If Sphinx and pyramids are the same age, then why is the visible erosion of the pyramids different from the erosion of the Sphinx?

The truth probably lies in these factors:

1. The result of the excessive rain around 2000 BC is that the then soft rock of BOTH the pyramids and the Sphinx suffered from rain erosion.

2. However, as the climate dried out and sandy desert took over, the lower-lying sphinx was soon largely buried in sand. This protected it from further sand blasting. Thus subsequent centuries of sand storms were unable to erode away the evidence of the original rain erosion.

3. By contrast, the pyramids, due to their elevation, were not covered and protected. So, openly exposed to centuries of wind-blown sand storms, the original rain erosion was scoured away.

This is why today's visible erosion of the pyramids is different from the erosion of the Sphinx.
RADICAL NEW EVIDENCE

We now know that the climate of Egypt right up to 2000 BC was WET... WET... WET!

Yes, there is good evidence that the immediate post-Flood centuries shortly before 2000 BC, and for some time after, were characterised by heavy rainfall and flooding in Egypt. So it is not necessary to go back to 7000 BC to find Egypt's wet period.

1. The date of the Great Flood is now fixed at 2345 BC. 
   (See Chapter 5.)

2. In 1999, the Potsdam Institute for Climate Research, in Germany announced the result of research that indicated the Sahara Desert to be only about 4,000 years old (originating around 2000 BC). This figure was based on desert growth patterns, rate of growth, and so on. (July 15, 1999. Geophysical Research Letters)

3. Plant and animal species depicted in the early tomb paintings show that the weather of Egypt was then wetter than it is now. It certainly did rain in the Old Kingdom, more than today.

4. Evidence of snails or worm action around the pyramids indicates a more temperate Mediterranean type climate in the not too distant past. Ross, a correspond from Yokohama, Japan, e-mailed me to report that “in many small crevices in the rocks all around the Giza area I found hundreds of ancient snail shells - whereby the creatures would have been seeking more and more sheltered places in an environment that was becoming hotter and drier - before they completely died out in that latitude.” He continues:

   The shells were between 4000 to 2000 years old, so it's obvious that the desertification of the area
happened quite recently. I also found evidence of worm-casts in rock crevices which again indicates that these creatures were seeking cooler, damper places for the same reason. There are no earthworms in the soil around Giza now, but in the not too remote past they existed in quite considerable numbers so much so that you can still find evidence of their existence in the worm casts they left behind. Not as easy to find as the numerous snail shells, but they are there nevertheless.

My conclusion is that the area around the pyramids was a lot cooler and wetter 4,000 years ago!

5. The record of Joseph in the book of Genesis tells us that Egypt had a climate which enabled it to be the grain basket of the world as late as 1700 BC, whilst the Dead Sea region was described as like the Garden of Eden around 1970 BC. These were not descriptions of the weathered desert they are today!

GLOBAL CLIMATE
WETTER FOR CENTURIES
AFTER THE FLOOD

It is naïve to imagine that the climate of the Middle East has remained unchanged over thousands of years. There is much evidence that prior to 1000 BC, large forest trees covered especially the higher elevations. This would have resulted in a much greater rainfall than exists today.

Grasslands would have supported a wide range of domesticated animals. There is also much evidence that the land occupied today by Israel and Jordan supported a wild animal population that is not unlike that of North Africa. Elephant herds even roamed Northern Syria. The demand for tusks was so great that they became extinct by the 8th century BC.
As a result of deforestation, by 1000 BC the climate had changed dramatically.

Evidence of the lushness of the region can be seen from the cemetery at the ruins of Bab edh Dhra and neighbouring sites to the southeast of the present Dead Sea. They all had very large cemeteries, containing tens of thousands of burials. These people all depended on the fertility of the surrounding countryside. Examination of skeletal remains indicates that they were robust, healthy people.

From study of remains at Bab edh Dhra, we know that the people were growing and harvesting wheat, barley, grapes, olives, figs, lentils, chickpeas, flax, pistachio, almond and assorted wild plants. There is strong evidence that irrigated agriculture was practised.

In analysing the sediment core from the Sea of Galilee, researchers have “found that the $^{18}O$ isotope was depleted in the deposits… [from] around 2000 years BCE. Such a depletion reflects colder, therefore wetter, climate conditions.” (A.S. Issar and D. Yakir, “The Roman Period’s Colder Climate”, Biblical Archaeologist, Vol. 60, No. 2, June 1997, p.104. Also: M. Stiller, “The Late Holocene Sediments of Lake Kinneret (Israel): Multidisciplinary Study of a 5m Core”, Geological Survey of Israel, Ministry of Energy, Jerusalem, 1984)

Similar evidence exists for North and South America, Asia and Australia. (Jonathan Gray, The Corpse Came Back, chapter 20)

EGYPT – ESTABLISHED AFTER 2200 BC

As we noted in Chapter 11, there is startling new evidence that Egypt did NOT spring up UNTIL AFTER the 2345 BC Great Flood – specifically during the period 2250 to 2188 BC.

Yes, there’s been a massive dating mistake!
And the transition from ice age to the present desert environment did NOT take place between 10,000 and 3000 BC, but as recently as 2250 to 2000 BC. (See Chapters 4 and 5; also Appendix 1.) Menes (Mizraim) and his followers arrived, embanked the Nile and established the Egyptian civilization.

That’s when the pyramids and the Sphinx were built!

**COULD THESE BE PRE-FLOOD STRUCTURES?**

It may be asked, But is it possible that the Sphinx was a pre-Flood artefact that the Egyptians simply embellished when they stumbled upon it?

From information now available on the Great Flood, it is evident that this was a mightier event than we have imagined. During this cataclysm, continent and ocean were churned up together and the earth’s crust was disrupted thousands of feet deep. Valleys got filled with silt up to a depth of 60,000 feet in some places. (See the evidence of unprecedented earth changes that occurred at this time, in the book *Surprise Witness* [http://www.beforeus.com/second.html](http://www.bbeforeus.com/second.html)

In this re-structuring event every square foot of the planet’s surface was altered. Neither the pre-Flood surface level of Egypt nor any man-made structure had a donkey’s hope of surviving without being buried.

Does the Sphinx date back to 10,500 BC? No, not before 2200 BC. Another myth comes crashing down.
DATING OF GREAT PYRAMID


HOW OLD IS THE GREAT PYRAMID?

In the 19th century, the Astronomer Royal of Scotland, Professor Piazzi Smyth, spent 6 months camped near the Great Pyramid. He went to work with the mind of a Master Astronomer to solve some of the pyramid’s mysteries. Smyth explored the Descending Passage which pointed upward to the sky on the pyramid’s northern face. He found that it was set at an angle of 26 deg. 18 min. 10 sec.

The eminent Sir John Herschel had discovered that this Descending Passage pointed to a Constellation of stars known as Draconis (“The Dragon”). With careful astronomical calculation, Smyth now confirmed this.

While in the Descending Passage, Smyth was excited to find two “Scored Lines”, which pointed upwards at right angles. These indicated to an astronomer to examine their direction in the sky.
These “Scored Lines” were about 4 feet long. Smyth was amazed at their precision. Having long been an astronomical transit observer, he felt that he was in the familiar surroundings of an observatory! Calculating carefully, he found that these “Scored Lines” pointed upwards, through the Pyramid, to the star Alcyone in the constellation known as “The Pleiades”.

Alcyone was regarded as the PIVOT of the solar system, around which all other “fixed stars” appear to revolve. It was called “The Central One”.

Professor Smyth made an exciting discovery. At the SAME TIME that the Descending Passage was pointing to the POLE Star (Alpha Draconis), these “Scored Lines” were pointing to Alcyone, the “PIVOT” star. That conjunction took place on September 22nd, 2144 B.C.
ALCYONE – THE “FOUNDATON STAR”

Here, fixed into the pyramid’s construction, was a definite date - 2144 BC.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we may now ask, could the “scored line” indicate 2144 BC as defining the EPOCH OF THE PYRAMID’S FOUNDATION?

And now a remarkable fact comes into play. Tradition from the Euphrates region (Mesopotamia) seems to identify Alcyone with the ceremony of FOUNDATION-LAYING. This is significant when you discover that the Pyramid builders have been traced to a Euphratean origin. (D. Davidson and H. Aldersmith, *The Great Pyramid: Its Divine Message*, p. 215) There is clear evidence that Egypt owed its impulses to Mesopotamia. (Jonathan Gray, *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*, Chapter 16)

Furthermore, a researcher into ancient astronomy informs us that “Alaparos (the second of the ten antediluvian kings of Euphratean legend) is equated with Alcyone (Tauri). The Euphratean astronomical abbreviation of the Sign is Te or Te-te, the highly abraded form of the Akkadian *dimmena* (‘foundation-stone’) = Assyrian, timmena-timmen-timme-tim-tem-te (‘foundation’). The ‘Foundation’-star (*Temennu*) is the Pleiad, or particularly *Alcyone*.” (Brown, *Primitive Constellations*, vol. 1, p.57)

Was the pointer to Alcyone the “FOUNDATION Star” fixed in stone to record the date of the “FOUNDATION” of the Pyramid? A strong probability.

The “scored line” defines actual observations at midnight of two successive Autumn Equinoxes, that of 2145 BC. and that of 2144 BC. These observations fix the astronomical zero for reckoning of days, as associated with midnight. They likewise define the commencement of the Pyramid's solar year at the Autumnal Equinox.
“INCH” AND “CUBIT” LINK

Before we proceed further, it is well for us to understand that in ancient buildings, two standards of measurement attract our attention – the cubit and the inch. In Egypt, the royal cubit of 20.6 inches is well known. Less known is the inch. So from time to time I am asked, “Why quote inches, an English measure that was not then invented?”

The answer is, the inch was known. Measurements of ancient buildings show that the “inch” (by whatever name) was from very early times a standard measurement.

The British inch is derived from the pyramid inch. The famous astronomer Sir J. Herschel established that one pyramid inch equalled 1.0011 British inches. This inch is one 500-millionth part of the earth’s polar axis.

*When used together*, the royal Egyptian cubit and the inch have a relationship which we call the Golden Ratio. You see, the *cubit of 20.6 inches multiplied by 3 is 61.8 inches*.

Now, 61.8 percent is a ratio found right through nature. It is also known as the Fibonacci ratio, or *phi*.

Whether in galaxies or seashells, an inner curve of a spiral is 61.8 percent of the diameter of the next spiral, and so on. The human body is likewise designed on combinations of this ratio of 61.8 percent. (*See my e-book, The Golden Proportion*)

The survival vessel for the Great Flood, according to Genesis, utilised the 61.8 factor. Its length was 300 cubits. And its height was 30 cubits = 618 inches. (*Genesis 6:15)*.

300 cubits (at 20.6 inches to the cubit) = 6180 inches.
30 cubits (at 20.6 inches to the cubit) = 618 inches.
Surveyors of a wreck in Turkey, believed to be the remains of the Ark, have found seven examples of this .618 ratio embedded within the structure. (See Jonathan Gray, *The Ark Conspiracy*, Chapter 8.)

The 20.6 inch pre-Flood cubit used in the Ark was later taken to Egypt to become the royal Egyptian cubit. Remember, it was Mizraim, Noah’s grandson, who founded Egypt. (See Chapter 11 of this present work.)

It is when both the cubit and the inch are interlocked in usage that we get the Golden Ratio – phi.

The oldest structures of antiquity, including the Great Pyramid, display this feature of phi.

Piazzi Smyth, in measuring the pyramid, found the number of inches in the perimeter of the base equalled one thousand times the number of days in a year. He also discovered a numeric relationship between the height of the pyramid in inches to the distance from earth to the sun, measured in statute miles.

Yes, the ancient inch is a significant factor in the construction of the Great Pyramid.

**FLOOD DATE ALSO DEFINED**

We have already established that a clean break in world history occurred in 2345 BC – namely, the Great Flood. (See Chs. 4 and 5.)

The Flood ended in 2344 BC.

A discovery within the Great Pyramid independently confirms this date.

According to researcher Basil Stewart, the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* suggested that the Ascending Passages would represent “years for inches" in the Pyramid. (Stewart, *The Mystery of the Great Pyramid*, pp 17-19)
From the “Scored Lines” of 2144 BC, the passage was measured - until at 200 inches a dark granite plug was reached. Calculating on the “inch to the year” scale, this brought interesting results.

If these 200 inches truly represented 200 years, then the conclusion was astonishing. Why? Because 200 years would pinpoint the precise date of the ending of the Great Flood in 2344 BC!

Had this dark plug been set in place to symbolize the darkness which came over the earth at that time?

Let it be understood that I am not endorsing such things as predictions of the future in pyramid measurements, as some do. We are simply attesting to some known facts of history.

Then emerged something almost as startling.

The star group Aquarius (“the Waterman”) was also found to be featuring in the astronomy of the Pyramid. Ancient peoples associated AQUARIUS with the waters of the GREAT FLOOD. The accepted date for the ending of the Great Flood is 2344 BC. And would you believe, the SAME “Scored Lines” that pointed to Alcyone the Foundation Star in 2144 BC, also pointed to the precise spot in the sky where AQUARIUS would have been directly overhead in 2344 BC!

Just think about that.

A POST-FLOOD STRUCTURE

I am NOT saying that the Great Pyramid was already built before the Flood, with its “scored lines” standing there pointing to Aquarius while the Flood was on.
No, the pyramid was built AFTER the Great Flood. (Its measurements incorporate the length of the new, post-Flood 365¼ day year, and NOT the pre-Flood 360 day year.) And the “scored lines” were positioned to commemorate an event that had already occurred.

THE HISTORIC WAR BETWEEN GOOD AND EVIL

Just as the Great Pyramid recorded the Great Flood, so in a sense, the Great Pyramid encapsulates the struggle between Good and Evil.

The ancient races believed that the devil (represented by a serpent, or dragon) had hijacked Planet Earth and entrapped mankind into rebellion against the Creator. They also recorded this understanding in the pictures of the constellations on their star maps.

In 2144 BC, Thuban-Alpha of the DRACONIS Constellation (representing the DRAGON, SATAN) shone down the Descending Passage towards the so-called “Bottomless Pit” at the bottom. In the ancient world, Satan (Lucifer) was understood to have caused man’s descent to darkness, desolation and death.

That star of the Dragon constellation, shining over the Descending Passage, symbolised SATANIC INFLUENCE.

By contrast the “Scored Lines” pointed to the PLEIADES which symbolised a sweetening influence. Hence in the old book of Job we read:

*Can you bind the SWEET INFLUENCES of Pleiades?* (Job 38:31)
In ancient traditions, the Pleiades star group was associated with benign influence and blessedness.

So in this sense, the Great Pyramid encapsulates the struggle between Good and Evil. Did they see the uplifting influence of the Pleiades as a symbol of the Creator’s intervention to save man from the results of his own folly? Was this a message that man need not be always on a slippery downward path but can look upward?

This much is certain. The ancient world was very conscious of the two opposing forces behind world events.

The influence of Evil, well illustrated by the Descending Passage with the Dragon Constellation shining down it, was depicted by writers such as Isaiah:

How you are fallen... O Lucifer [The Dragon]. For you have said in your heart, ‘I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit . . . in the sides of the NORTH.’
(Isaiah 14: 12-15)

Appropriately, the Descending Passage with the Dragon Constellation Pole Star, Thuban-Alpha, shining over it, is situated on the NORTH face of the Great Pyramid!

Modern Astronomy has confirmed that midnight, September 22nd, 2144 BC, was the date when Alcyone of the “sweet” Pleiades was in position over the “Scored Lines”, just at the same time when Thuban-Alpha of the “evil” Draconis was shining down the Descending Passage to the “Pit”.

Thus Astronomy gives a date which may have great significance for the Great Pyramid.
CALENDAR CLUES TO THE AGE OF THE GREAT PYRAMID

The ancient calendars had a **360 day year**. In harmony with this, the earth was divided into 360 degrees. The ancient **Chinese** calendar was 360 days long. So was the Babylonian. And the Roman. And the Mayan. And the Indian. And the Egyptian.

But later, every nation changed its calendar. This rearrangement of the calendars in antiquity has long been a puzzle to scholars. Why did ALL those ancient nations change their calendars from years of 360 days to 365 ¼ days?

Because they later got clever – or is there another reason?

My neighbour Rob Payne thought he had come up with the answer. “Oh, I can explain that,” he said. “The ancients first proposed a rough system of yearly count, and later, when their mathematical knowledge increased, they refined it.”

Nice try, Rob. Except we’ve now discovered that those ancient peoples were already excellent astronomers and mathematicians - yes, even when they created the 360 day calendar.

For example, the Maya have left us some of their calculations. They computed the synodal period of the moon as 29.5209 days, as accurately as we can calculate today with our sophisticated equipment. Their degree of accuracy would surely not have been less for the year.

Now let me ask you: Why would so many cultures in such widely scattered regions of the world all have made the very same mistake for the length of the year, and then all rectify it in the same way?

I know some folk like to think the Great Pyramid of Egypt is much older. But there is good reason to believe that it was built
within a few hundred years after the Flood. The Great Pyramid accurately stands in the centre of the land surface of the earth as it NOW exists and must have existed at the time the pyramid was built.

It could be called a huge planet marker, a giant survey post. It marks both the longitude and latitude at which there is more land and less sea than at any other meridian on earth.

Evidently the builders were well acquainted with the exact amount of land on the surface of the earth as it existed AFTER the Flood (not before), as well as its geographical distribution. This suggests that results of the post-Flood global survey were already in.

It would also explain why the NEW LENGTH OF THE YEAR was also incorporated into the measurements of the Great Pyramid.

The external features, dimensions and units of this pyramid together give precisely and accurately every essential value of the earth’s PRESENT motions and orbit – not the PREVIOUS one that existed before 2345 BC.

This identifies the Great Pyramid as a post-Flood structure. Definitely not pre-Flood.

For example, intentionally or by accident, the circuit distance around its base, measured direct from corner to corner, is 36,524.22 primitive inches. This is exactly 100 times 365.2422 - the value in days of our solar year.

Even though the calendar was still 360 days long.

This is so astonishing, we must take off our hats to those early post-Flood scientists. They were ahead of us in many ways.
There was no rough count; it was precise to the ten thousandth of a decimal point.

**WHAT REALLY HAPPENED**

A tablet discovered at Tanus in the Nile Delta in 1866 reveals that in the ninth year of Ptolemy Euergetes (c. 237 BC), the priests at Canopus decreed that it was “necessary to harmonise the calendar according to the present arrangement of the world.”

The reason the ancients gave for the re-calculated calendars was *not* that they were in error, *nor* that they had improved on more primitive techniques. It was that there was a “changed order of things.”

And with each passing century, the calendar misalignment had become more pronounced.

The nations that sprang up after the Flood with a ready-made culture, inherited their knowledge basically from the world that was wiped out at the Deluge. They continued where Noah left off. They inherited, along with everything else, the antedeluvian (pre-Flood) calendar of 360 days.

Was there, at the time of the Deluge, a change not only in the planet’s axis, but *a change in its orbit*, which in turn caused the lengthened year?

It does bring to mind that curious biblical reference to the Creator, who was believed to “move the earth out of her place.”

(Isaiah 13:13)
WHY WERE THE PYRAMID’S BUILDERS FORGOTTEN?

The fact that the later Egyptians were ignorant or vague concerning the origin of the Great pyramid is often used as a reason to speculate that it must have been built before Egyptian history began.

For example, it is said that when Herodotus and other historians travelled to Egypt, during the 5th or 6th century BC, the priests at that time were unaware of how the Pyramid was build or by whom. Herodotus does mention about Khufu being the builder, but his views often contradicted the writings of travellers who visited after him. So it is clear that the Egyptians of that time were not sure about the age of the Great Pyramid or its builder. They didn’t have any proper documentation.

The question naturally arises that if it was really a part of Egyptian history, then why didn’t they know about its origin?

1. THE BUILDERS WERE NOT EGYPTIAN

According to some ancient reports, the construction of the Great Pyramid was not an Egyptian initiative, but during the reign of Cheops (Khufu) outsiders were responsible for its construction.

From what we have learned more recently, this is very likely correct. There is good reason to believe that its construction was not Egyptian, but resulted from the worldwide geographical survey undertaken within centuries of the Flood, in which Giza was found to be in the precise centre of the earth’s land mass. (See the map on page 121.) In fact, at least two old maps linked with the ancient past (the Piri Reis and Reinal) were based on a circular projection with the focal point in Egypt. (Concerning the global mapping expeditions, see Appendix 2)
And why forget this origin? The truth is that Pharaohs were fond of commemorating their own victories and achievements, but neither their defeats nor the triumphs of foreigners. Since the Great Pyramid was not an Egyptian achievement, it is understandable that the Egyptians of later centuries could not, or were unwilling to, state who built it.

2. HISTORICAL ACCURACY WAS NOT A PRIORITY

All the evidence goes to show that the Egyptians were severely practical. They sought to learn, not from any joy in the attainment of truth for its own sake, but simply for solving everyday problems. (James Baikie, The Story of the Pharaohs. London: Black, 1908, p. 59) As practical men, they were not given to abstract study and recording.

The truth for its own sake, as an intellectual treasure, was not of greatest priority. So inscriptions we dig up don’t carry a date, nor a ruler’s sequence number. Keeping a strict record of their history was not a practical need.

3. AMID ENVIRONMENTAL TRAUMA, MUCH CULTURE WAS FORGOTTEN

The turbulent climatic and tectonic changes in the post-Flood centuries exacted a traumatic degenerative effect upon the populations. During this period there was also a sudden, dramatic, and frightening drop in the human life span, as well. This is recorded by both the ancient Chinese and the Hebrews. (See my book The Corpse Came Back, chapter 18.) Much earlier knowledge was quickly lost. This included loss of superior technology and a rapid deterioration culturally from the high level at which the early post-Flood nations, including Egypt, had begun. (For a more detailed explanation of this decline, see my book Dead Men’s Secrets, chapters 5, 6 and 9.)
Considering these three factors, it should not surprise us that in later centuries various conflicting legends arose concerning the origin of the Great Pyramid.

**TWO EXTRA PYRAMID FACTS**

1. The Great Pyramid, at 30 degrees 00 minutes north and 31 degrees 14 minutes east marks both the longitude and latitude at which there is more land and less sea than at any other meridian on earth. That is, it marks the precise centre of the land mass of the post-Flood world.

![Map of the world showing the geographical centre of the land surface of the whole world](image)

2. The Great Pyramid’s latitude (30 degrees 00 minutes north) is precisely an “ark’s length and height” south of the remains of Noah’s Ark (39 degrees 26 minutes north) in Turkey. That is what you discover when you transpose the Ark’s dimensions onto a world map, so that its length and height (515 + 51 feet = 566) become minutes of an arc. (This is the same as the latitude difference between the two objects: 9 degrees 26 minutes, or 566 minutes of an arc.) (See my DVD, *The Persian Triangle Mystery.*)
These post-Flood measurements concur with the earlier evidence that the Great Pyramid was post-Flood in origin.

**BUT WHAT ABOUT THE PRE-FLOOD THEORY?**

Still, there are some who will continue to object that the Great Pyramid has to be pre-Flood because, firstly, the Egyptians did not have the technology, and secondly some medieval writer said it was built by a pre-Flood civilization to preserve ancient knowledge. These claims ought to be addressed.

**THE EGYPTIANS AND TECHNOLOGY**

**Question 1:** If the Flood survivors handed down their knowledge of a ready-made, high pre-Flood culture, so that it was possible to build the Great Pyramid in 2144 BC, just 200 years after the Flood, then what happened to that knowledge during the intermediate two centuries? And, really, was there even enough time?

**Answer:** The few Flood survivors, although bringing with them knowledge from the pre-Flood world, were too few in number to put most of it to practical use immediately. It was only when the population had reached a critical mass that something could be done with this knowledge. Nevertheless, population growth was rapid, as we shall discover in the next chapter.

The antediluvian knowledge passed down was sufficient to give a rapid start to the new cultures that sprang up “out of nowhere” soon after. And the timing. Two hundred years was all it needed. The oldest civilizations appear just long enough after the Deluge for a population density to support a culture.
**PRE-FLOOD KNOWLEDGE IN THE GREAT PYRAMID**

**Question 2:** But might not the Great Pyramid have been built before the Flood? Because, in his *Khitat*, the 14th century Arab writer and preacher Al-Maqrizi says that in the pre-Flood era, Sourid built the pyramid to guard ancient knowledge.

**Answer:** It is true that the pyramid does guard ancient knowledge, but not as secret tablets hidden within the structure. The ancient knowledge which the Great Pyramid guards is incorporated into its dimensions and positioning. But these bear the features of a structure erected AFTER the Flood, not before.

So what about that 14th century legend? Sorry, but as with Herodotus, Strabo and others, so with Al-Maqrizi. All these men lived so far after the events that the best they were able to do was to pick up speculative legends that were available to them. If you want to know the truth you can never safely rely on such late legends.

Again, we must not forget that the Great Flood of 2345 BC was so total in its effects that it marked *a clear break in history*. During this cataclysm, continent and ocean were churned up together and the earth’s crust was disrupted thousands of feet deep. The result? No structure on the surface of the planet could have survived.

Back, then, to our very first question: Constructed in 10,500 BC? Definitely not before 2144 BC. Kiss another myth goodbye.
DATING OF SUMERIA

A popular writer says that “the biblical tales of Creation, of Adam and Eve, the Garden of Eden, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, were based on texts written down millennia earlier in Mesopotamia, especially by the Sumerians.”

So, he says, the Sumerian texts are thousands of years older than ‘the biblical tales’ – 6,000 years old, we are told.

Are they?

“EXAGGERATED” TIME PERIODS IN SOME ANCIENT WRITINGS

The same popular writer quotes a Babylonian history of the ten pre-Flood kings which covers “432,000 years’ total reign”. One who reads his work gets the impression that he believes it to be literally true. (Zecharia Sitchin, The Earth Chronicles)

Now this calls for a little sensible thought. Did you know that in this king list to which this dear man refers, one king is said to have reigned for 64,800 years! The obviously overstated “reign” of each king raises immediate doubts. It seems dubious that the highly civilised and intelligent Babylonians could believe such a figure.

Yet, our friend has attributed such nonsense to them… even, it
seems, to believing it himself. I say this with respect. But it appears he does not understand the ancient text that he is quoting.

The solution to this absurdity is simple. The Babylonian unit of measurement, the *sarus*, had two different values - (1) the astrological (corresponding to a time period of 3,600 years) and (2) the civil (corresponding to 18½ years).

When this is understood, the problem evaporates.

You need only divide the reign of each Chaldean pre-Flood king by 3,600 to arrive at the basic number, then multiply it by 18½ to obtain the writer’s intended meaning.

The changes brought about through this method are so startling that in some cases the so-called reigns of the legendary Chaldean kings become almost identical with the important highlights in the lives of the biblical patriarchs; that is, the birth of their eldest sons.

“432,000 years’ total reign” becomes “2221 years”!

And this brings the new Chaldean figures of pre-Flood years believably close to the approximate number of years the Bible ascribes to the time that expired between Creation and the Flood….

Compare the Septuagint total with the Chaldean account of 2,221 years, and we arrive at a difference of 21 years - a breath of years that is almost negligible.

Interestingly, the book of Genesis states that mankind polarised into two basic groups before and until the time of the Flood. The first group (Adam to Noah) continued for ten generations. The second group (the line of Adam’s son Cain) occupied eight generations.
Sumerian tradition likewise preserved two lists of “kings” who reigned before the Flood. One of them contained eight names (as does the family tree of Cain), the other ten names (as does the family tree of Genesis 5.)

At last the Sumerian document makes sense!

**VERIFIABLE WRITTEN HISTORY – ABOUT 4,000 YEARS**

Now, about the age of these Sumerian texts. Are they 6,000 years old, as claimed?

No verifiable dates for written records go back earlier than about 4,000 years, approaching our date for the Great Flood. Any earlier dates are based on questionable assumptions and are highly speculative. If one is determined to push everything back further, one has to speculate, without evidence. Keep in mind that our goal is to discover the FACTS. We want verified information.

Historians and other scholars almost universally recognise that recorded human history began in Sumer, in the Middle East.
The dates given for Sumer's origin vary widely among scholars, although the recent trend has been toward later, rather than earlier, dates - typically ranging from about 3500 BC to about 2900 BC, with some scholars setting dates both earlier and later than these. At least one reputable source, *Encyclopedia Britannica, Book of Knowledge*, under “History”, dates it as late as about 2350 BC.

Some scholars have assumed that the list of 10 kings (which we have discussed above) is a reference to the earliest origins of Sumer. Because of this assumption, taking 50-60 years per life of each king, these scholars would be adding about 500-600 years onto the history of the Mesopotamian peoples.

However, as we have seen, the evidence strongly suggests that the list of 10 kings is not part of the history of Babylonia or Sumer at all, but rather of the ten patriarchs before the Flood. So how old is Sumeria?

*A firm historical date* is one in which there are *sufficient links with other* historically known dates that it is accurate to a scientific certainty (or at least within a handful of years, as opposed to decades, centuries, and millennia).

The oldest such firm historical date is of the Egyptian Pharaoh Sesostris III (about 1878 BC).

Earlier than about 2000 BC, then, archaeologists must make an inordinate number of assumptions (which are largely subjective in nature). Therefore, historical dates older than 2000 B.C. cannot be as trustworthy as later dates.

We must face this truth: There are not sufficient links with historically known dates to be able to assign a reasonably certain date to the origin of the Sumerian civilization. However, there are enough links to know to a degree of scientific certainty that
it was the very first human civilization in recorded history - that is, with writing and a known culture.

This much is certain:

1. There are no firm historical dates before about 2000 BC.
2. Carbon-14 is known to be unreliable in dating the Sumerian-Babylonian civilization, so we are left to estimate.
3. The Sumerian civilization was the first known in history. This is agreed by all.

After Alexander the Great had defeated Darius in 331 BC at Gaugmela near Arbela, he journeyed to Babylon. While there he and his scholars learned about the 1903 years of astronomical observations from the Chaldeans of Babylon.

That placed the founding of Babylon at \textbf{2234 BC}, or about ten years after the birth of Peleg. This matter was recorded in the sixth book of \textit{De Caelo} (‘About the Heavens’) by Simplicius, a Latin writer in the 6th century AD. Porphyry (an anti-Christian Greek philosopher, 234–305 AD) stated the same thing. Anstey points out, regarding the Mesopotamian region:

\begin{quote}
The Era of the Chaldean dynasty of Berosus, the earliest which has any claim to be regarded as historical, is placed somewhere about the year B.C. 2234. (Martin Anstey, \textit{The Romance of Bible Chronology}. London: Marshall Brothers Ltd., 1913, p.92)
\end{quote}

This is uncannily close to the biblical date for the Tower of Babel (c. \textbf{2244 BC}) five generations after the Great Flood, from which sprouted the Sumerian culture and Babylon.

The fact is that history, in the sense of written records, harmonises fairly well with the Bible chronology.

Sumerian documents 6,000 years old? And a dynasty of kings reigning 432,000 years?
The truth is that no Sumerian document dates earlier than about 2000 BC. These Sumerian texts are not 6,000 years old, as claimed, after all!

**SPEED OF POPULATION GROWTH**

It may be asked, was there enough time after the global Flood of 2345 BC, for Sumer to develop before 2000 BC?

I am going to ask you to take the ancient documents seriously, for a moment. (And I’m speaking of the book of Genesis in particular.) Now I know that it is a popular pastime for some to label it a myth. But just humour me, if you will, and we’ll deal with that “myth” idea later. For now, let’s just take the old account at face value.

Place yourself in their shoes. After the Flood, Noah and his family are the total world population. Those eight people must feel a deep sense of being alone. Surely they have a great longing for children.

And that they started to fulfil that longing right away is indicated by the fact that the first recorded post-Flood birth was in the year after they came out of the survival vessel. (two years inclusive – Genesis 11:10)

Several factors would have favoured a rapid population growth:

1. The Table of Nations in Genesis 10 suggests that **large families** must have been normal. Sixteen sons are listed for Noah’s 3 sons. Since each boy had a wife, Noah’s 3 sons must also have had about an equal number of daughters for a total of, say, 32 children, or just under 11 per couple. Eleven sons are listed for Canaan and 13 for Joktan. How many daughters they had, is of course,
unknown. From these examples it seems reasonable to suggest that the average family had at least 10 children.

2. **Longevity** also favoured rapid population increase. (Jonathan Gray, The Killing of Paradise Planet, pp. 33,55-56) Given the facts of the book of Genesis, it would not be unreasonable to suggest a low mortality for at least the first 200 years after the Flood. These factors would favour rapid population growth. Also, according to Genesis 10, the time span from the birth of one generation to the next (not the length of life) averaged 30 or so years, or about three generations per hundred years.

At ten children per family per generation, what would have been the population in 100 years after the Flood? In 200 years after the Flood?

With three couples to start (Noah’s three sons Ham, Shem and Japheth, with their wives), each couple having ten children, and having their first child at 30, the following would have been the result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Yrs after Flood</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 begins</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 begins</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 begins</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 begins</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this result, the yearly average population growth would have been a little over 5.5 percent.

**A MODERN EXAMPLE**

An example of rapid population growth (mainly from births) from Canadian history, may be of some interest.
In the conquered province of Quebec, the people multiplied with astonishing celerity. In 1760, their numbers were approximately 60,000, and in 1790, 160,000, an increase in one generation of about 166 percent, about 5 percent annually. The birth rate after the conquest seems to have been higher than before it; in 1770 it had reached the astronomical figure of 65 per 100. After all, there was land and food for all. (A.R.M. Lower, *Canadians in the Making*, 1958, p. 113)

The conquest spoken of was the British conquest of Canada in 1759 and 1760.

The increase mentioned was wholly or mostly due to births. After 1759 there was very little immigration for quite a few years.

So, to answer the question, was there enough time after the global Flood of 2345 BC, for Sumer to develop before 2000 BC? Indeed there was.

An interesting outcome of all this is that biblical chronology and secular history are found to be consistent with each other.
DATE OF TIAHUANACO

Titicaca. At 12,000 feet altitude, it is the highest navigable lake in the world.

But did you know that 4,000 years ago Titicaca was on sea level? We’ll discover, in this chapter, what happened.

It can be demonstrated that the mountain chains of the Caucasus, China, Tibet, the Rockies, the Alps and the Andes all rose to their present heights in historical times. We have the same “late” dating from all parts of the earth.

Certainly the Andes mountain range must have risen abruptly in comparatively “recent” times.

At 11,500 feet, a curious whitish streak runs along the side of the mountain range for over 300 miles. It is composed of the calcified remains of marine plants. This shows that these slopes were once part of the seashore.

In fact, many lakes up in the Andes region are completely salt.

One such lake is Titicaca. At 12,500 feet altitude, it stretches 138 miles in length and is in places 70 miles wide.

A watermark of salt along the lake shore now runs at an angle to
the water level. Originally it must have been horizontal. Clearly the land was not only thrust up to its present altitude, but was tilted in the process.

Not only is the water saline. On the beach of this lake high in the mountains, there are seashells as well as traces of seaweed. The lake must have been a bay or inlet of the sea.

Even today, various sea creatures (including sea horses) survive in the lake.

Today this lofty, almost sterile region is capable of sustaining only a scant population.

Yet here we are confronted with a colossal mystery. Traces of a sizeable city lie at the southern side of the lake.

In the 15th century, Spanish conquistador Cieca de Leon reported his astonishment at seeing ancient gateways hewn from solid stone 30 feet long and 15 feet high and pivoting.
As recently as the 16th century there still stood immense walls with massive rivets of silver in the stonework as well as lifelike statues of men and women in a thousand animated poses.

Even until last century, travellers could admire and sketch imposing colonnades. Of these there is no trace today. The Spaniards and more recently the Bolivian government plundered them for building materials.

Of 400 acres of ruins, only about ten percent have been excavated. And although most above-ground stonework has been carted away in modern times, it is still obvious that a great city once existed here.

But here is the mystery. At an altitude of 13,000 feet, maize will not bear fruit. Yet endless agricultural terraces, now abandoned, rise as high as 18,400 feet above sea level, and continue up under the snow to some unidentified altitude.

Such an abundance of cornfields must have supported a huge population. The region is too high and too barren to do this now. Could the site once have been lower? You see, if the Andes were 2- to 3,000 feet lower than now, maize would ripen around Lake Titicaca and the city of Tiahuanaco could support the large population for which it was evidently built.

**ONCE A SEAPORT**

But are you ready for this? Here comes an even greater surprise… the remains of an ocean quay. That’s right, an ocean quay. It suggests that the city, when built, was at sea level - 12,500 feet lower!

The structure known as the Puma Punka, near the stadium of Tiahuanaco, startles the imagination. It appears to be the
remains of a great wharf and a massive, four-part building, now collapsed.

One of the construction blocks from which the pier was fashioned weighs an estimated 440 tons (equal to nearly 600 full-size cars) and several other blocks are between 100 and 150 tons. The quarry for these giant blocks was some ten miles away.

The remains show five distinct landing places, harbours with moles and a canal which heads inland. The docks are vast - and one wharf is big enough to take hundreds of ships.

So we’re faced now with a sea harbour at 12,500 feet altitude and 200 miles inland! Staggering, isn’t it?

Well, someone says, perhaps these gigantic docks were intended for ships on Lake Titicaca. Good try. But I’ll tell you why not. You see, they face in the opposite direction from the lake. Not only that, the mooring rings on the stone piers were so large that they could only have been used by ocean-liner sized vessels.

This place - I tell you - was a seaport on the Pacific coast. AND IT WAS THRUST, SO TO SPEAK, TWO MILES INTO THE SKY! Now, how about that?

You’ve probably heard it said that mountain making took “long ages”… that in the case of the Andes (the second highest mountain range on earth), it occurred more than a million years ago. Well, I’m sorry to be a spoil sport. But the change in altitude occurred AFTER the city was built.

And since only a few intermediate surf lines can be detected, the elevation could not have proceeded little by little.

The explorer Colonel H.P. Fawcett, who travelled this region early last century, was persuaded by the evidence that Tiahuanaco had been destroyed by the terrible seismic
upheavals which accompanied the raising of the Andes to their present height. (Fawcett, *Exploration Fawcett: The Travel Diaries and Notes of Colonel H.P. Fawcett*. Edited by B. Fawcett, London, 1953) And I believe he got that right.

**WORK INTERRUPTED**

There is some evidence that the monoliths of the city were not entirely finished when the catastrophe struck and suddenly raised the whole city and lake 12,500 feet. What a staggering thought!

Cast-down builders’ tools were found in the ruins when the Spaniards came upon the place in the 16th century. The heaps of blocks of mason-cut stone bear evidence of sudden abandonment… men fleeing for their lives, taken by surprise.

After the disaster, the populace lay buried in gullies that had become mass graves, covered by silt.

Fragments of skeletons, both of animals and men, lay scattered among the ruins. Jewels, pottery and tools were found mixed in utmost confusion.

Can you imagine hundreds, if not thousands, of cubic miles of our planet almost instantly heaved upward? From such an event, violent earthquakes must have spread throughout the entire globe.

This massive uplifting exposed a continental shelf which is now the desert lowlands of Peru and northern Chile.

**AGE: 15,000 BC?**

Tiahuanaco has four surviving primary structures. These are named the Akapana pyramid, the Kalasasaya platform, the Subterranean Temple, and the Puma Punku.
The Subterranean Temple, the Kalasasaya, the Akapana are precisely oriented to the cardinal directions. North and south point toward the geographical poles defined by the axis of rotation.

The Kalasasaya structure, a rectangular enclosure measuring about 450 feet by 400 feet, is delineated by a series of vertical stone pillars and has an east-west orientation.

One who studied these remains was Arturo Posnansky. He measured the lines of sight along these stone pillars, as well as the orientation of the Kalasasaya, and what appeared to be purposely-intended deviations from the cardinal points. From these, Posnansky believed that the alignment of the structure was based upon an astronomical principle called the obliquity of the ecliptic.
In astronomy, *obliquity*, (also called *axial tilt*) is the angle between an object's rotational axis, and a line perpendicular to its orbital plane.

Do not confuse this with inclination. The earth's orbital plane is known as the *ecliptic*, and the tilt of the earth's axis is called the *obliquity of the ecliptic*.

The Earth is tilted on its axis 23 ½ degrees in respect to the plane of the solar system.

Posnansky theorised a gradual variation in the tilt of the earth’s axis over time, and thought that the astronomical alignments of those structures might indicate that the initial construction of the Kalasasaya and Tiahuanaco was around 15,000 BC.

Some others checked Posnansky’s measurements and declared them to be accurate. And today, his early date for Tiahuanaco is accepted unquestioningly by a number of writers.

One thing we should bear in mind is that at Tiahuanaco there are no inscriptions to help us with dating.

**THE PROBLEM**

But there is a problem which these men have overlooked. It is this.

Any theory concerning the earth’s past axis depends upon us *knowing beyond doubt* that

1. either *no sudden earth change* has intervened to upset such theorised alignments,
2. OR if such a change did intervene, then *how extensive was the earth change* and *exactly when* did it occur?

Despite all our wishing, attempts to establish a 15,000 BC date from astronomical data, must fail - for the simple reason that a
dramatic and disruptive earth change HAS occurred. This was when the earth was violently tipped off its axis in 2345 BC. (See chapter 5 of this present work.)

Therefore the precise orientation of the Tiahuanaco buildings to the new PRESENT DAY directions of north, south, east and west, must have occurred since this event.

Put simply, this tilting of the earth’s axis in 2345 BC from perpendicular to 23½ degrees plays havoc with Posnansky’s 15,000 BC calculations.

You cannot count back using earth's present relative stability as a reference point.

**WHAT ABOUT 200 BC?**

Conventional theory holds that the civilization which spawned Tiahuanaco rose around 200 BC and fell into decline sometime soon after 1000 AD.

This started with Wendell Bennett's excavations, which turned up numerous examples of pottery, small statues and other artefacts.

However, many of these appear to have been left behind by later arrivals.

As we know from archaeological discoveries, later arrivals were often awed by massive ruins (sometimes attributing their origin to supernatural beings, thus replicating the "sacred" images on their own pottery and textiles).

So, bearing this in mind, it is a mistake to fuse the two cultures (an original and a later) into one, implying that the later arrivals were the same people who built the original ruins.
I believe Bennett and his successors have made such an error.

**2200 to 2000 BC**

There is only one solution that can satisfy all of the mysteries regarding the ruins of Tiahuanaco.

And what is this solution? It is simply to be aware of the geological upheavals which affected the entire globe geologically and climatically, in the centuries following the Global Flood.

**1. BUILT DURING POST-FLOOD GLOBAL EXPLORATION AND SETTLEMENT**

As the Flood survivors stepped down from their survival vessel, they gazed upon a world totally foreign to them. Gone was the enchanting, subtropic environment they knew. All the familiar landmarks had been swept away.

Instead, barren wastes, bleak and sterile hills and unbearable extremes of cold and heat confronted them. Great mountain ranges—high, forbidding, rocky walls—had been thrust up, destined to isolate areas into harsh climatic pockets.

The first generations were born and grew up in the foothills of Ararat. But in time their curiosity was to draw them out to stake new territories and to search for valuable resources.

They soon found a world reduced considerably in land area. The fertility of the soil and the natural resources necessary to human progress were now unequally distributed.

Within centuries the rapidly increasing population sent out exploratory expeditions. Soon almost every corner of the world
was visited by a group of men who came with a particular task to accomplish. Their mission was to relocate resources, map and colonise.

Surviving today are portions of ancient world maps whose origins stem from this early period. These maps were drawn by surveying parties before, during and after the Ice Age. (See Appendix 2.)

They are so accurate, only one thing could explain them - a worldwide survey. It is evident that over 4,000 years ago somebody undertook a survey of the whole planet. The technology at their disposal was very sophisticated.

How do we know it was around that time? At least two of these old maps linked with the ancient past (the Piri Reis and Reinal) were based on a circular projection with the focal point in Egypt. And we know when Egypt got started – during the period 2250 to 2188 (See Chapter 11).

We also know that the results of such a survey were preserved within the measurements of the Great Pyramid (2144 BC).

It can be no accident that the Great Pyramid records in its dimensions the measurement of the earth on the scale of 1:43,200.

When the Great Pyramid was constructed, both the earth’s circumference (including the equatorial bulge) and polar radius (with the flattening at the poles) were known with an accuracy comparable to that recorded by today’s satellite surveys from space. (See my book Dead Men’s Secrets, chapters 3 and 16.)

The dating of
(a) the Great Flood (2345 to 2344 BC – see Chapter 5),
(b) the founding of Egypt (2250 to 2188 BC – see Chapter 11) and
(c) the Great Pyramid (2144 BC - see Chapter 13) enables us with a fair degree of certainty to date the world survey somewhere within that time period of 200 years – a little
over 4,000 years ago. And, since maps drawn by the surveying parties recorded conditions before, during and after the Ice Age (see Appendix 2), that places the Ice Age around that same general time frame.

Apart from the above, there is also a mass of physical evidence that the Ice Age occurred only about 4,000 years ago. (See Chapter 4, and Appendix 1. Also, Velikovsky, *Earth in Upheaval*. Chapter entitled “Thirty-five Centuries Ago”)

The establishment of Tiahuanaco as a seaport within a few centuries after the Great Flood, during the period 2200 to 1500 BC, fits comfortably with the fact that the extremities of the earth, including South America, were mapped and colonised during this period.

**2. RAISED DURING PERIOD OF POST-FLOOD RELEASE OF CRUSTAL STRESS**

Tiahuanaco’s sudden elevation from sea level to 12,000 feet, makes sense when we realise that the early post-Flood centuries were marked by violent tectonic adjustments, as the earth’s crust readjusted to the new stresses placed upon it.


There is no need to invoke long evolutionary periods. The earth’s surface can alter rapidly. Even in modern times, the ocean has been known to raise or lower its islands or its depths, as much as thousands of feet.

A recent example was during an earthquake off the northern tip of Sumatra on December 26, 2004, the sea bottom in the Straits of Malacca uplifted almost 4,000 in only about 3 minutes.
The US-based National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, which analyses spy satellite imagery and produces maps and charts for the Defence Department, was reported to have received information that one area of the Straits of Malacca, which separates Malaysia from the Indonesian island of Sumatra had its depth cut from 4,060 feet to 105 feet.

In another affected area, a merchant marine ship logged that the depth was cut from 3,855 feet to just 92 feet. (Star newspaper, Kuala Lumpur, January 13, 2005, quoting a report in the shipping journal Portsworld)

The US Navy reportedly sent two ships to re-chart the waters. Sonar images from British navy ship HMS Scott showed the massive uplift of a large area 10 kilometres wide and up to 1.5 kilometres high (4,800 feet plus).

Of course, compared to the widespread crustal adjustments in the early post-Flood centuries, the effects felt today are relatively few in frequency. I mention this recent event only to illustrate that substantial up or down land movements did not require vast periods of time.

The fact that
(a) land can move vertically up or down a great distance in a brief period of time;
(b) tectonic adjustments were especially violent and widespread in the early post-Flood centuries;
(c) Tiahuanaco shows evidence of being violently raised from sea level to 12,000 feet, with the sudden elevation of the Andes;
Tiahuanaco does fit comfortably with the tectonic events of this 2000 BC to 1500 BC period.

3. ORIENTED TO TODAY’S COMPASS POINTS

Today’s earth axis, with its north and south poles, is tilted 23½
degrees from the vertical axis that existed before the Great Disaster.

However, Tiahuanaco’s buildings are not oriented to the pre-Flood axis, but are exactly oriented to the compass points of today’s post-2345 BC world, with its new axial tilt.

4. TIANUANACO DEPICTS NOW-EXTINCT ANIMALS

The harsh cold and wet climatic conditions which persisted for several hundred years after the Flood also led to the extinction of numerous animals that were struggling to gain a foothold in new areas still sparsely vegetated, during that difficult climatic period.

The citizens of Tiahuanaco were evidently familiar with these animals, many of which became extinct soon after.

When this is understood, then the depictions among the ruins of Tiahuanaco of numerous now extinct animals are readily explainable.

5. TIME-LINK TO EGYPT

Finally, there are a number of striking parallels between the cultures of ancient Egypt and of the Tiahuanaco region.

There is evidence which strongly suggests there was contact between ancient Egypt and Tiahuanaco.

1. The construction and use of reed boats on Lake Titicaca, in the vicinity of Tiahuanaco, follows a custom whose origins are lost in the mists of time. However, the reed
boats of Lake Titicaca are identical to the reed boats of ancient Egypt.

2. Many of the building blocks in Tiahuanaco are held together by large copper clamps shaped like an I. Others (now dismantled) were held together by silver rivets. The system used here reminds one of that used in the Egyptian ruins on Elephantine Island on the Nile.

3. Copper trepanning instruments of Tiahuanaco (for opening the cranium) were identical to those used by the Egyptians – as were the methods used!

It is very unlikely that these fineries of detail could have arisen independently. They point rather to direct contact between Tiahuanaco and ancient Egypt, as contemporary civilizations.

Interestingly, in the Brazilian province of Amazonas, the French engineer Apollinaire Frot came upon an ancient carved rock hidden by dense jungle close to a river, which recorded the journey of an early Egyptian priest to what is now Bolivia (the land of Tiahuanaco). The inscription gave directions to silver and gold mines.

Since we know that ancient Egypt was founded around 2200 BC, this enables us to date Tiahuanaco with some certainty.

All of the known facts place Tiahuanaco perfectly within an early post-Flood 2000 BC context but imperfectly with any other time frame.
We are so used to hearing it, that I shall go over this just once more.

Have you heard it said that "Stone Age" Aborigines have been in Australia for 20,000 years, or that primitive tribes were in the Americas 15,000 years ago?

So ask yourself this question: HOW FAR BACK CAN WE GO WITH ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY?

As far as dates are concerned, where does fact end and speculation begin?

The answer is, only a few centuries before 2,000 BC. And the reasons for stating this are compelling.

Yes, it’s true that much older dates have been suggested by historians. For example we’re told that man already had a brain larger than ours 60,000 years ago and left drawings in 30,000 BC that would do justice to a modern painter.

But think about it. If this is so, then why would man have waited so long to develop cities and the type of agriculture associated with them? We should expect that those isolated civilizations
which developed independently would be somewhat spread out over this period.

Even one civilization from 20,000 BC would be strong proof against our account of the worldwide Flood. But, I repeat, the oldest confirmable dates for cultures on earth all go back to about the same time — a little before 2000 BC.

**SPECULATION VERSUS EVIDENCE**

Even modern dating techniques cannot take us back further than about 2,000 BC. Dr. W.F. Libby, a foremost authority on modern dating methods, who won the Nobel Prize for his research on carbon-dating, was shocked to discover this limitation. He reported:

> You read statements in books that such and such society or archaeological site is 20,000 years old. We learned rather abruptly that these numbers, these ancient ages, are not known accurately; in fact, it is at about the time of the First Dynasty of Egypt that the first historical date of any real certainty has been established. (A.J. White, *Radio Carbon Dating*, pp.156-158)

As noted in my book *The Great Dating Blunder*, under normal conditions, radiocarbon dating is fairly reliable to about 4,000 years ago. Then the disparity runs wild. You see, this dating method depends on the assumption that atmospheric radiation has remained constant.

The trouble is that any traumatic environmental change occurring in the past would have accelerated the decay rate, adding to "apparent age," if calculated on the assumption of uniformity.

Thus an upheaval like the Great Flood disaster of 2345 BC would play immeasurable havoc upon readings prior to about
2,000 BC. It’s as simple as that.

Let’s not underestimate the impact of the Deluge. The thing to remember is that this event was a universal catastrophe. It encompassed epic changes: mountains rising and falling, tidal waves rushing faster than the speed of sound, as well as thousands of Krakatoas belching out dust to darken the atmosphere for centuries. Anything that could happen did happen. Seismic and atmospheric distortions persisted for hundreds of years.

You can be sure of this. The earliest civilized cultures that can be dated go back no further than the post-Deluge period.

CAVE CULTURES
CONTEMPORANEOUS WITH CITY CULTURES

And the same can be said for primitive men. Here are some bones found in caves near Rochebertier, in France. How old are they? "Twelve thousand years," we’re told. But notice these script characters on them. What nags at me is this. They resemble and in some cases are identical to the script of Tartessus (of the period 2200 to 2000 BC).

So I ask you. Are we to believe that a script, once developed, would remain relatively unchanged for 10,000 years? It does not happen. So what do the two scripts really demonstrate? Just this— that the cultures must have been of the same period. Do you see?

The same is true of Paleolithic antler bones found at Le Mas d’Azil and La Madelaine. These are inscribed with signs identical to Phoenician script from about 2000 BC.
And painted pebbles from Le Mas d’Azil are marked with signs and symbols that were once predominant throughout the Mediterranean — again around 2000 BC.

What does this all mean? Simply that "Stone Age" and "civilized" cultures existed at the same time! And, by the way, not 12,000 years ago.

Yet we are still asked to believe in a long progression, first from caveman to Stone Age, thence to wandering hunters, to settled farmers, and later to cities and civilization.

I feel sorry for the evolutionist, but that will not do.

There is enough evidence now to show that these groups existed simultaneously, each aware of the other. On this point, ancient literature agrees with the latest archaeological findings.

Just as even in today’s "Space Age", there live "Stone Age" tribes on all continents except Europe.

Concerning primitive people, Thor Heyerdahl, the "Kon-Tiki" explorer, observed correctly that their intelligence is "exactly like our own" (In the film, The Case of the Ancient Astronauts, cited by Clifford Wilson in The War of the Chariots, pp.148-149)

In other words, ‘stone culture" implies neither "dim-witted" nor "prehistoric." There’s no 20,000 BC here.

**WHAT ABOUT 10,500 BC?**

What about it?

Not infrequently one comes across the date 10,500 BC being quoted for some great disaster that befell the planet, wiping out a civilization. It all started with one writer. And since then, you
will notice others glibly follow one another, parrot fashion.

And so it is assumed that human history has gone on virtually uninterrupted since perhaps 10,000 BC. And that no worldwide catastrophe such as the Great Flood has intervened since that time. And most certainly, it is asserted, human history is older than the biblical book of Genesis states.

Writers speak of this matter-of-factly, unemotionally, as if this presented no problem. Dates and data are bandied about as if everything were cut and dried.

Well, the “experts” putting out this tale have been snookered! And they don’t even know it yet.

I will go along with the fact of a past worldwide disaster. But for this we already have good evidence of a date. It is not 10,500 BC.
DATING OF ATLANTIS

Well, what about the dating of Atlantis? The truth is, all we have is a legend. Yet, where is smoke, there is fire. Legends are usually based on a core of truth, even if the final story becomes garbled or embellished.

So two possibilities are worth noting, in regard to Atlantis.

Firstly, there are some similarities between the story of Atlantis and what we know concerning the pre-Flood world. It is possible that this story is a recollection of the highly technological world that was destroyed during the Great Flood.

Secondly, since the tectonic upheavals of the Flood there have been some violent adjustments as the earth's crust settles back to equilibrium. Such releases of stress have included some significant vertical droppings or raisings of land. (See The Corpse Came Back, chapter 19.) It is quite reasonable, therefore, to presume Atlantis to have been a real location which suffered submersion since the Flood.

The following discussion was published many years ago in a book titled The Atlantis Hypothesis, pp. 124-125:

“… the location most often theorized [for Atlantis] was the Azores, which fit most closely with Plato’s description. The Pillars of Hercules to which he referred may be a reference to Gibraltar. Furthermore, the Azores, of volcanic origin, consist of the same geological formations
mentioned by Plato, namely red, white, and black rock, and contain hot and cold springs.

“Although small volcanic islands may have risen and sunk within recent times, however, it has never been proved that a large island mass has existed in recent geological times in the vicinity of the Azores. Cores from the bottom of the Atlantic near the Azores show evidence of vulcanism of a pattern characterized only by land volcanoes. This may more reasonably suggest small volcanic islands than a large land mass that sank.

“The main problems in solving the Atlantis riddle are the time factor and the size of the island described by Plato.

“First, the time factor: Plato dates the disaster that destroyed Atlantis 9,000 years before Solon's time, or 12,000 B.C… but Plato’s dates do not conform to other evidence.

“The Atlantis Plato described is very similar to a Mediterranean type of culture not noticeably different from that readily understood by Solon and Plato. There is also a mention of a war between Atlantis and the Greeks, and the descriptions of chariots and galleys. The 9,000 years is perhaps not an exaggeration but an error in dating.

“Second, if we are considering an island-based empire in the Mediterranean, the size of the island or islands constitutes a further problem.

“Many authorities have reasoned that if Plato's Atlantis was based on historical fact, it referred to the island-based Minoan sea-trading empire of Crete. The difficulty in this thesis was in reconciling the statistics given by Plato with the geography of Crete and its associated islands.

“The size of the plain, as given by Plato, was three thousand by two thousand stadia, or roughly 340 by 230 miles. This plain is much larger than the plain of Messara in Crete, or of any plain on mainland Greece.

“The ditch was stated to have been 10,000 stadia or 1,100 miles long, and was divided into 60,000 lots of land, each one square mile in area. The leader of each lot was required to furnish for the war between Greece and Atlantis one sixth of a war chariot, two horses and riders,
one light chariot, a foot soldier with shield, a charioteer, two heavily armed men, two archers, two slingers, three stone shooters, three men, and four sailors to man the ships, of which there were 1,200.

“According to this formula, the military forces of Atlantis would have comprised 1.2 million men, an army far larger than any Bronze Age civilization could have possibly mustered.

“But what if Solon had erroneously translated the symbol for 100 as 1,000? The two symbols in Cretan script are almost identical. (Dr. Angelos Galanopolous, a Greek seismologist, first suggested this error in translation as a means to resolve the problem of dates.) Instead of 9,000 years, we would have 900 years before Solon. The disaster would have occurred about 1500 B.C. If the size of the plain were reduced by a factor of ten, to 34 by 23 miles, it would approximate closely the size of the plain of Messara on Crete.

“It has been reckoned that the Royal State of Atlantis, and the Citadel, or Capital, refer actually to two islands; the larger would be Crete and the Island of the City would be Thera. Again, reduced by a factor of ten, the dimensions given by Plato fit Thera almost exactly.

“Reduced by ten, the 60,000 lots become 6,000; 1,200 ships become 120 ships, and the size of the army is reduced to 120,000 men, which would conform with the kind of military power exercised in the Mediterranean in the second millennium B.C.

“These figures would seem to make sense in connection with the Minoan sea empire of Crete, with its capital city on Thera. Further, it has recently been found that around 1500 B.C., a colossal volcanic eruption occurred on the island of Thera, which completely destroyed the center of the island. The ensuing tidal waves, earthquakes, and deposits of volcanic ash wrought havoc throughout the entire Mediterranean basin, Egypt, the Palestine coast, Turkey, and mainland Greece, and virtually destroyed the civilization of Crete.”

A FOURTH-HAND ACCOUNT

From our distance in time it is impossible to be certain as to the authenticity of the Atlantis legend or the precise time of the destruction of this legendary kingdom. However, there are
reasonable grounds for placing the event (assuming it occurred) within the post-Flood era.

Plato told the story of Atlantis, an island “beyond the Pillars of Hercules” (Gibraltar), which sank suddenly below the sea about 9,000 years earlier.

Plato wrote his story around 360 BC. He received the story fourth-hand, before writing it down. Plato’s version is the sole source of the account.

About 600 BC, an Egyptian priest told it to the Greek Solon (638-559 BC). Solon told it to young Critias (his grandson) when he was a ten-year-old boy. Young Critias eventually retold it to his friend Plato.

**ALTERNATIVE DATES FOR ATLANTIS**

If there was a tenfold discrepancy in the translation of the Egyptian scripts by Solon, then the symbol representing 100 was rendered as 1000. The same sort of confusion in modern times is seen in the contrast between the American billion (a thousand million) and the English billion (a million million).

This cutting of all figures used in Atlantis to 1/10 of their value, would enable Atlantis to fit into the Mediterranean. (Plato, confused by the exaggerated figures of Atlantis, was forced to place Atlantis outside the Pillars of Hercules because it would not fit into the Mediterranean.)

Immanuel Velikovsky makes this pertinent observation:

Critias the younger remembered having been told that the catastrophe which befell Atlantis happened 9,000 years before. There is one zero too many here…. Numbers we hear in childhood easily grow in our memory, as do dimen-
sions. When revisiting our childhood home, we are surprised at the smallness of the rooms – we had remembered them as much larger. Whatever the sources of the error, the most probable date of the sinking of Atlantis would be in the middle of the second millennium, 900 years before Solon, when the earth twice suffered great catastrophes… (Immanuel Velikovsky, *Worlds in Collision*. London: Sphere Books, Ltd., 1978, p. 152)

Whether or not Velikovsky’s final conclusion is correct, his reasoning is plausible.

Yet, even if we dismiss the possible tenfold exaggeration of the Atlantis figures, I believe there is an even more plausible cause for the dating error.

Just bear in mind that

(a) the Egyptian priest gave his usual exaggerated date of 12,040 BC for the founding of Egyptian civilization, and that
(b) the same priest claimed that Atlantis existed (and perished) before the beginning of Egyptian civilization.

Would this not then adequately explain the excessively early date given for Atlantis’ destruction?

If so, there is no need to move Atlantis away from the Atlantic and “misplace” it into the Mediterranean, just to fit into our picture. Twisting evidence to fit any theory is not acceptable. Wherever the evidence will lead, the theory must concede.

And so, our “big picture” now available concerning Egyptian chronology suggests this better, second reason for the confusion among researchers – that the Egyptian priest’s exaggeration of Egyptian chronology was to blame for the exaggerated dating of Atlantis.
But when the Egyptian dating is corrected, the Atlantis dating falls naturally into line also.

Interestingly, an ancient history book, the *Oera Linda Boek*, dating primarily from AD 803, but added to for 500 years, bears this postscript: “written in Liuwert (Ljuwert) in the 3,499th year after Atland (Atlantis) sank, or 1256, the year of the Christian reckoning.” This historian placed the sinking of Atlantis in 2244 BC. (Alec Maclellan, *The Lost World of Agharti*. London: Souvenir Press, 1982, p. 186)

In the *Melpomene* of Herodotus, it was stated that someone just a few centuries before 2000 BC visited both the mainland of Atlantis and a maritime Atlantis.

In Chapter 11, we discovered Egypt’s founding to be as recent as 2188 BC, a date which is fairly soon after that given in the *Oera Linda Boek* (above) for the destruction of Atlantis.

**TO SUMMARISE**

**ALTERNATIVE 1:** Cutting of all figures used in Atlantis, including the dating, to 1/10 of their value, would enable Atlantis to fit into the Mediterranean.

**ALTERNATIVE 2:** Firstly, the Egyptian priest gave an exaggerated date of 12,040 BC for the founding of Egypt. Secondly, he claimed Atlantis existed (and perished) before the beginning of Egyptian civilization. This suggests that the Egyptian priest’s exaggeration of Egyptian chronology is the *real reason for the exaggerated dating of Atlantis*.

Thus, when the Egyptian dating is corrected, the Atlantis dating falls naturally into line also.

And an Atlantic location would not be preposterous after all.

Atlantis 9600 BC? Not at all.
The evidence suggests the more reasonable date of 2200 to 1500 BC. Goodbye to another time myth.
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THE GLOBALIST AGENDA

As you know, our attitudes are influenced by parents and environment. And later we may find we’ve picked up some wrong ideas. That’s often hard to face.

You may be surprised to learn that many leading scientists are now questioning the validity of evolution. But the damage has been done. It has had a free hand and little or no opposition in the universities and colleges, and through the press and television, all these years.

To systematically dull down the minds of the masses, a well-heeled elite have been shrewdly preparing and using a compliant servant team of “nice guy” educators whose doctorates, salaries and grants depend on toeing the line – who will parrot the ideology that “we’re here by accident - humans are not children of the Creator, but ‘useless eaters’ that are expendable to evolutionary progress.”

Evolution makes a hero out of death and completely negates all morality and humane compassion. When you tell people that they are evolved animals that are floating on a lawless and indifferent planet in outer space they begin to act as just that - lawless animals with no morality or accountability for themselves.

Welcome to the genocide plans of the New World Order crazies.
THE FALL GUYS

In fairness, it must be stated that the front men - the educators - are the fall guys. They sincerely believe in what they are doing. That’s all they’ve been taught. Most of them are so lacking in understanding of what they are part of, that they, like most of the population, play a part in advancing an agenda they do not even know exists.

Prodded on by those unseen ones who pay their salary, they call on flimsy archaeological data to convince themselves that what they are told to teach is right. Their mentors hover in the background, out of harm’s way.

It’s a scam that goes on every day… in the controlled universities, the media and in religious seminaries. But let’s tell nobody… what a lovely idea.

DATA IS FAKE

And, to perpetuate it - well, first, are you sitting down? – here is a headline released on June 4, 2009, in *Times Online*:

“One in seven scientists say colleagues fake data”

News reporter Hannah Devlin opens with this shocking revelation: “Faking scientific data and failing to report commercial conflicts of interest are far more prevalent than previously thought, a study suggests.”

The simple fact is that the ideological battle is bigger than most of us realise. The New World Order gang, swilling in their trillions of dollars, have a pretty tight grip on the propaganda machine. This includes the media, the film industry and education. It is crucial to their plan of mass mind control.
AND A MASSIVE COVER-UP

They consider the Bible – and in particular, the book of Genesis - to be “dangerous”. It is subversive to their plans. It is a document whose power they fear. They know that once it captivates the minds of the masses it has power to undermine the Globalists’ plans to rule and suppress.

For several hundred years now, the Globalist plan has been in motion. And they are almost there.

They’ve created a well-oiled anti-Bible propaganda offensive that is almost impossible to avoid. And it has rubbed off on us, until we find ourselves gobbling it up. Thankyou Madhatter.

They cannot stop Bibles being printed, so they’ve turned to perpetrating one of the biggest lies of all time, first by peddling the evolution theory and its bogus dating, then by conning us that the Bible has been altered so much you can’t believe it anyway. All made wonderfully possible by our gullibility.

At the same time, these nice people are involved in a massive cover-up of real evidence. They talk about cover-ups of the truth. The only cover-up seems to be by these “professionals”.

Kenneth Kitchen, Professor of Egyptology in the School of Archaeology and Oriental studies, University of Liverpool, hits it on the head. He laments that “scientific and archaeological research is not getting through to young people in schools and colleges – particularly all the evidence supporting the reliability of the Bible.

In some circles there even seems to be a deliberate withholding of such information, yet it is the fruit of leading scholars… known for their restrained, moderate, factual presentation of their researches.”

(Forward to Victor Pearce’s book Evidence For Truth: Archaeology, 2nd edition)
Ignoring this research, the critics persist in trying to make us believe that Genesis is a patchwork of myths tossed together as late largely from Sumerian and Babylonian legends as the 6th century BC. You’ve got to laugh, really.

This claim arose 150 years ago before archaeology began making its Middle East discoveries. But no informed scholar believes that any more. It was a claim founded upon ignorance. Nobody had enough knowledge on the subject, let alone to refute it.

Today there is no excuse. And many critics have admitted their mistake.

Yet others persist, always doubting, the one mechanically repeating the other – simply because they have not kept up with the discoveries.

Kenneth Kitchen of the University of Liverpool, compares the various ancient accounts with the Genesis account:

The common assumption that the Hebrew account is simply a purged and simplified version of the Babylonian legend is fallacious on methodological grounds. In the Ancient Near East, the rule is that simple accounts or traditions may give rise (by accretion and embellishment) to elaborate legends, but not vice versa. In the Ancient Orient, legends were not simplified or turned into pseudo-history (historicized) as has been assumed for early Genesis. (Kenneth A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and the Old Testament, p. 89)

Millar Burrows of Yale University, points to the fact that “Mere legend or fiction would inevitably betray itself by anachronisms and incongruities.” (M. Burrows, What Mean These Stones? New York: Meridian Books, 1956, p. 278) But this is not the case with the biblical records.

A scrutiny of the Babylonian texts reveals that they represent not an original source, but a hopeless corruption of an original
source. They do demonstrate at an early period the introduction of dozens of contemporary gods into the Creation tablets.

On the other hand, the records preserved to us in Genesis are pure and free from all these corruptions which penetrated into the Babylonian copies.

The Trustees of the British Museum, in *The Babylonian Legends of the Creation and the Fight Between Bel and the Dragon*, declare that “the fundamental conceptions of the Babylonian and Hebrew accounts are essentially different.”

From his direct research, archaeologist Sir Ernest Budge agrees: “It must be pointed out that there is no evidence at all that the two accounts of the creation which are given in the early chapters of Genesis, are derived from the seven tablets.” *(Babylonian Life and History)*


To an impartial reader, the book of Genesis bears the hallmarks of an authentic, original and superior document.

But to mouth the old claim that the Sumerian texts are the original, false though it be, is all part of our new age of freedom. (Not to mention freedom from facts.)

And a large segment of the gullible public has swallowed this hook, line and sinker.

But the lies are starting to unravel. Aren’t you glad?
THE GENESIS DATES

We have discovered the same approximate dating from a variety of natural clocks and ancient human records in all parts of the planet. According to these witnesses, a Great Flood interrupted world history 4,000 to 5,000 years ago. Astronomical evidence even gives us a precise date – 2345 BC. (See Chapter 5.)

Someone will be asking, What about the Bible version of events? In particular, the book of Genesis. How valid is it?

A BOOK OF MYTHS?

During a recent radio interview in the USA, a talk-back listener told me he thought Genesis as a book of “myths”.

Well, perhaps he’s right. Is it? And what are these so-called “myths”? Well, here are a few of them:

- Firstly, mankind is an artefact of creation by the same Celestial God that created the universe.
- Secondly, a global wipe-out occurred about 4,400 years ago, which remodelled the earth’s surface and shaped most of the natural features we see on earth today.
- Thirdly, the historical civilizations of Egypt, Sumeria, the Maya, and so on, emerged after this.

And may I add a fourth:
• That this global cataclysm re-set the natural timing clocks.

The Genesis “myth”, if you want to call it that, also states that mankind is a special creation of the same Supreme Being who created the whole universe and everything in it. This entity is a loving God, who initially gave us a perfect world, governed by physical and spiritual laws for our protection and happiness. He also granted us freedom of choice and a responsibility to care for each other.

But we have turned our backs on our Creator, chosen to go our own way, and become alienated against Him – and this has brought us to the misery in which the world now finds itself.

That is the basic theme of the book of Genesis – apart from the history it contains.

**DATE OF THE FLOOD - ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE RECORD**

Anyway, getting back to the dating question. You might well ask, How does the biblical book of Genesis (and the Bible as a whole) stack up, compared to the various natural clocks and ancient records we have discovered in all parts of the planet?

Does the Bible itself pinpoint any date for the Flood?

The answer is yes. The biblical writings supply us with a series of chronologies which, linked together, pinpoint the time of the Flood.

Would you like to check this for yourself? Here goes…
Please follow this carefully. (Remember that as you calculate backwards through the BC era, numbers increase. That is, instead of subtracting, you add the numbers together.)

We start by calculating back from a known, fixed date in history. This is the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar in 586 BC. This event brought an end to the kingdom of Judah. The accuracy of this date can be astronomically verified by Babylonian records. (Edwin R. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*)

Now take this date – 586 BC - and add to it the years of the kings of Judah after Solomon. The chronology of these kings was very carefully preserved and documented in Jewish history. According to the Old Testament records, these years of reign totalled 345.

So add these - $586 + 345 = 931$ BC – to get the last year of Solomon’s reign. Since we know that Solomon reigned for 40 years, then his first year would have been 970 BC. We must be sure and count the first year. This gives us 970 BC.

The next time marker is Solomon’s fourth year. Reckoning inclusively, this would be 967 BC. And why do we need to include this in our calculations? Because this is a time peg for another event:

> And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon’s reign over Israel, in the month Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord. (1 Kings 6:1)

According to that historical passage, Solomon’s fourth year, 967 BC, was the 480th year from the Exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt. $967 + 480 = 1446$ (counting inclusively).

The Scripture states also that from Abraham’s call to sacrifice Isaac (according to the sacrificial “law”), until the Exodus, was
430 years. This is when the covenant with Abraham was confirmed. - “because thou hast obeyed my voice.” (Compare Galations 3:17,18; Genesis 22:16-18; Genesis 15:13; Exodus 12:40-41)

Note that the Scripture does not say Abraham’s offspring would be in bondage for 430 years, but that their “sojourning” was for 430 years. The portion of this sojourning spent in Egypt was only 260 years, from 1706 to 1446 BC.

To arrive at the date of the Great Flood, you then add the chronological information supplied in the book of Genesis. (Genesis 21:5; 17:21-25; 16:16; 12:4; 11:10-32)

This brings you to the beginning and ending dates of the Great Flood - around 2345 to 2344 BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2345</th>
<th>1446</th>
<th>970</th>
<th>931</th>
<th>586</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Flood</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Solomon’s reign</td>
<td>Kings of Judah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l______________________l___________l_________l__________l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

480 years

Please keep in mind that this, as all dates, is approximate, due to the various kings of Judah not necessarily fulfilling the full 12 months of their first or last years of reign. However, we believe that the above dates fall within a 3 or 4 year margin of accuracy.

From this exercise we discover that the Genesis date for the Flood is in remarkable harmony with the timing given by each of the eight natural “clocks” that we noted earlier, as well as genealogical records of various ancient nations.

According to these witnesses, the Genesis timing for the Great Flood is correct.

Here is one more witness to consider – population increase.
POPULATION INCREASE
- c.4,000+ YEARS

We might also cite world population growth statistics. These likewise converge on the date of the Great Flood.

It can be demonstrated, by taking the rate of population increase, per century, and working back from our present world population (6,800,000,000), that mankind could have started with 8 people not very long ago.

Statisticians agree that 150 years is a reasonable average to assume for population to double itself, having made allowance for wars, famines, etcetera. Today’s global population, if counted back to an original 8 persons, would require slightly less than 30 doublings. By a doubling process every 150 years, this would require about 4,400 years.

Or to calculate by a different method, world population increases at about 2 percent per year. Let’s be conservative and halve it to an increase of 1 percent per year.

On average, every 82 years (through wars, diseases and natural disasters), half the population is wiped out.

Using this formula, over 4,350 years, how many people should we have now? - 7.3 billion. How many people do we have? - 6.4 billion.

Using the same formula, the population after 41,000 years would be $2 \times 10^{89}$ (That’s two times ten with 89 zeroes after it!)

It can be argued that exceptional events, such as Hitler’s massacres, plagues and natural disasters could have decimated populations. But even if HALF THE TOTAL WORLD POPULATION were wiped out, it would extend the historical span by only 150 years.
There have been periods of slow down and of rapid growth, but a continuous increase is evident throughout history.

If mankind has been around for as much as one million years, the population would have doubled only once in every 32,258 years, which is absurd.

All considered, the evidence is a pointer toward recentness of the type the Bible suggests. It is entirely reasonable and scientific to trace the entire human race back to eight people some 4,350 years ago.

The data is consistent with the proposition that Noah and his family were the only humans alive after a general wipe-out of the human race.

If man was not virtually wiped out, there should be a very much greater population across the earth’s surface.

**THE MOST ACCURATE OF ALL DOCUMENTS IS BY-PASSED**

Professor W. F. Albright, one of the leading authorities on archaeology, called the ancient “Table of Nations” in the book of Genesis “an astonishingly accurate document.” (W.F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands*, p.4)

In fact, Genesis explains where all the time is, in ancient history. It gives mathematical documentation. And if, as is now evident from archaeological research, it is a valid historical document, then it is truly the yardstick by which the time framework of all ancient world history can be measured.
INTEGRITY OF
THE GENESIS DATES

After testing the evidence, many an honest skeptic has unashamedly admitted his mistake. There comes to mind David Davidson, who for many years was Consultant Engineer for the City of Leeds, England. At first, Davidson was an agnostic. However,


Noted archaeologist Siegfried Horn found that discoveries in the ruins of Hazor, Shechem and other cities likewise confirmed biblical dates. (Siegfried H. Horn, Records of the Past Illuminate the Bible. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1975, pp.19,20)

Nelson Glueck, one of the greatest of all Middle East archaeologists, concurs:

It may be stated categorically that no archaeological discovery has ever controverted a Biblical reference. (Nelson Glueck, Rivers in the Desert: History of Negev. Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society of America, 1969, p.31)

The trend of new evidence is leading many archaeologists to align their dates increasingly closer to those given in the book of Genesis.

So where does this leave all that claptrap about Genesis being just a myth?

It appears that Genesis is better informed than its critics.
A DOCUMENT OF INTEGRITY

Recently, unbiased scientists have been testing a number of scientific statements in the book of Genesis with actually observed data – and it has passed the test.

We shall not go into those here. However, if you would like compelling scientific evidence that Genesis contains absolute, physical, factual truth – and not myth, I invite you to scrutinise the evidence in my book The Weapon the Globalists Fear, particularly chapters 2 to 4.

Likewise, front line archaeological research has established beyond reasonable doubt the integrity of its history. No living person is in a position to disprove the history it contains.

GENESIS VERSUS OTHER ANCIENT ACCOUNTS

Placing the book of Genesis side by side with the records of each of the ancient nations, there is one thing in particular we’ve discovered. Genesis tells a simpler, more coherent story.

It does not bear the marks of the superstitious, the magical or the grotesque, which occur in other ancient texts. Its record is straightforward, connected and concise. We have discovered it to be infinitely superior.
Five examples of its superiority stand out. For substantiation of each, I refer you to my book *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*, chapter 9.

1. **HISTORICAL PRECISION COMPARED TO OTHER RECORDS**

2. **NOT SPOILT BY LOCAL COLOUR**

3. **ITS MORAL FORCE**

4. **OLDER THAN ANY OTHER DOCUMENTS**

Portions of Genesis are demonstrably *older than any other* document. (See *The Weapon the Globalists Fear* chapters 18, 19.)

Eminent archaeologist William F. Albright points out that the archaic features contained in the Genesis record date it, for example, BEFORE any Mesopotamian version that is “preserved in cuneiform sources” (such as the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh and the Assyrian Epic of Atrahasis). (W.F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*. London: Athlone Press, 1968, p.86)

Startling archaeological evidence shows that Genesis was not only compiled by the Hebrew leader Moses, but also that he had access to a series of original volumes, going back to the first centuries of mankind. (*The Weapon the Globalists Fear* Chapters 11, 17 to 19)

These included a record physically possessed by Noah (Gen.6:9), and records possessed even earlier by Adam, the very first man! (Gen.2:4; 5:1) Both Adam and Noah – real historical personages - were living eyewitnesses of events they recorded!

You do not need to speculate on this. The archaeological evidence that has now been unearthed and documented is outstanding.
According to the evidence, these particular passages in the book of Genesis must constitute *the oldest documents in the world!* Can there be anything older than the first man?

It is true that no *verifiable* dates for written records go back earlier than about 4,000 years, approaching our date for the Great Flood. But the earlier chapters of the book of Genesis bear within themselves evidence of pre-Flood origin. There is good archaeological evidence that Moses, in his day, had before him tablets from before the Flood. *(This is fully covered in The Weapon the Globalists Fear, chapters 17 to 19.)*

**5. NUMEROUS DETAILS CONFIRMED BY ARCHAEOLOGY**

Archaeology has clothed in measurable fact many a “legend” (and its biblically claimed date) that long had passed for fable.

…new discoveries continue to confirm the historical accuracy or the literary antiquity of detail after detail in it… It is, accordingly, sheer hypercriticism to deny the substantially Mosaic character of the Pentateuchal tradition. *(C.H. Dodd, More New Testament Studies. Manchester: University Press, 1968, p. 224)*

I am compelled by the evidence, which is confirmed by upwards of 25 expeditions of my own in the Middle East, to agree with Sir Isaac Newton that it bears “more sure marks of authenticity than any [secular] history.”

In the above five respects, Genesis is UNLIKE any ancient document we possess.

However bold such a statement may seem, I assure you that the book of Genesis towers head and shoulders above every known document of the ancient world. It stands in a class by itself, for meaningful transmission of information. It bears the stamp of *a sophisticated and accurate document!*
RELIABLE HISTORY

Contrary to the claims of some critics, the evidence strongly suggests that what you read today in the book of Genesis is uncorrupted, unchanged, and pure, as reliable as the autographed original. *(The Weapon the Globalists Fear, chapter 20)*

CRITICS UNAWARE

It was not long ago that critical scholars thought that any who believed in Genesis were beneath notice, from a scholarly standpoint, because they refused to accept the impressive findings of the critics! They loved to ridicule the biblical dates.

These critics assumed they knew better 4,000 years after the event than writers who lived in the times immediately after the events.

In response, the most eminent of all Middle East archaeologists Professor William Albright, after examining the critics’ dating philosophy and the flawed reasoning that prompted it, observed, “This is typical of the **utter absurdity of much so-called ‘critical’ work** in the Biblical field.”

One should question the reliability of some other oft-quoted secular records instead of always doubting the Bible’s statements. When the truth is known, it will be seen that the Bible is **the standard by which all else can be safely judged.**

Supposed flaws raised by critics against the Genesis record have simply been caused by our ignorance. Nobody had enough knowledge on the subject, let alone to refute it.

Today there is no excuse. And many critics have admitted their mistake.
Yet others persist, always doubting, the one mechanically repeating the other – simply because they have not kept up with the discoveries. One suspects that many are too apathetic, bigoted and lazy to make the attempt, while others are tools of a well-oiled anti-Bible propaganda machine, that knows it can fool most of the people most of the time.

To anyone who repeats that old, tired, worn-out objection that the biblical books have been so changed over the centuries that we can’t know their original contents, my challenge now is:

Prove it.

My research on this matter is summarised in these four books:

*The Da Vinci Code Hoax*, chapters 14,20-21

*Who’s Playing Jesus Games?*, chapters 10-15

*The Sorcerers’ Secret*, chapters 2-7

*The Weapon the Globalists Fear*, chapters 20-21
NUMEROUS WITNESSES AGREE

- Earth’s tilted axis – 2345 BC - brought global devastation, followed by a new start with:
  - Ice and glaciers – c. 2000 BC
  - Trapped inland lakes – c. 2000 BC
  - River deltas – c. 1600 to 3000 BC
  - Waterfalls – c. 2000 BC
  - Coral reefs – c. 1700 to 2330 BC
  - The oldest trees – c. 2000 BC
  - Deserts – c. 2000 BC
  - China – 2205 BC
  - Britain – 2000 to 3000 BC
  - Ireland – 2000 to 3000 BC
  - Denmark – 2000 to 3000 BC
  - Norway – 2000 to 3000 BC
  - Iceland – 2000 to 3000 Bc
  - Egypt – c. 2200 BC
  - The Giza Sphinx – 2000 to 2200 BC
  - The Great Pyramid – 2144 BC
  - Sumeria – c. 2200 BC
  - Tiahuanaco – c. 2000 BC
  - Australian Aborigines – c. 2000 BC
  - Maya language – c. 2000 BC
  - Atlantis – c. 2200 BC?
Finally, the Book of Genesis dates the Great Flood at 2345 BC and the establishment of the earliest post-Flood nations at 2244 to 2000 BC.

**MY CHALLENGE**

Any critic who has not examined this information in depth is unqualified to pose as an authority on global dating. I now challenge every critic on earth to try and refute this evidence.

**CHOICE 1:** All these witnesses converge to about the same period. And beyond this, nothing can be honestly dated.

**CHOICE 2:** Against these, some person or other will tell us – without sustainable evidence – that he has just found something that dates back to 100,000 years or whatever.

If you had these two choices, and *if your life depended on it*, which would you choose?
AMAZON TRIBE’S
12,000 YEAR GENEALOGY?

Deep in the jungles of northwest Brazil, the mysterious Ugha Mongulala tribe hide away from the intrusions of prospectors and explorers. According to their chief, Tatunca, in a valley high in the eastern Andes there sit the overgrown ruins of a white stone city, the ancient capital of their once vast jungle empire, from which subterranean passages radiate.

In recent decades, Westerners lusting for wealth and supported by strong, highly superior arms, have advanced ever further into the Amazon: poisoning whole tribes by smallpox carried in pieces of candy; dynamiting jungle natives from the air, then mowing down the survivors with machine guns; and mixing the food of the Indians with arsenic and typhus virus. (Jonathan Gray, Dead Men’s Secrets, chapter 19)

After five centuries, from a former forest population numbering many millions, only a few thousand are left.

As the European penetrates ever deeper into their territory and they are forced to withdraw from their last fertile lands, many Indians have been reduced to feeding on caterpillars, tree bark and the lichen growing on rocks.

Frightened and confused by this incomprehensible event, tribes have grown increasingly hostile. Thus we hear of savages
manned with blowpipes, poison darts and spears, who kill on sight every intruder.

Their hearts are heavy. Angrily they retreat further and further into the jungle; and they know that time will soon run out.

It was in 1968 that the Ugha Mongulala made an historic decision. To prevent the discovery of their ancestral white stone city of Akakor by airplanes, the chief's high council gave orders to camouflage all temples, palaces and houses. This once mighty people had lapsed into a state of dismay and despair.

Rather than fight, they now withdrew within shrunken borders. Only small scouting bands were left behind in the abandoned regions to observe the movements of the hostile whites and to forewarn Akakor of an attack.

The situation became still more critical. By 1971, his surviving subjects dejected and discouraged, the prince advised a slow withdrawal into the underground dwellings. The people gave up their houses and destroyed the buildings of their last remaining settlements, so that white hunters and prospectors would find nothing but abandoned ruins, overgrown by the forests. They left no sign, no trace that might have pointed the way to the city of their ancestors.

THE “12,000 YEAR” HISTORY

According to Karl Brugger, investigator and writer on South American Indians, and also according to a prospector friend of mine who was captured by the tribe and spent several months learning their ways, the Ugha Mongulala have inherited a unique written history, containing a carefully preserved and detailed genealogy which goes back more than 12,000 years.

THE “OFIR” CONNECTION

My interest took a sharp upward curve when I discovered possible points of contact between this Ugha Mongulala Chronicle and the Israelite record of King Solomon’s voyages.

We already knew that
1. King Solomon (970-931 BC) and his neighbours, the Phoenicians, had an alliance.
2. Phoenician ships of Solomon’s time were visiting South America. (See Appendix 3.)

I want you to notice these similarities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UM CHRONICLE</th>
<th>SOLOMON’S SHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lhasa... commanded the construction of <strong>OFIR</strong>, a powerful harbor city at the mouth of the Great River [Amazon]. <strong>Ships from Samon’s empire</strong> docked there with their valuable cargoes. In exchange for <strong>gold and silver</strong>… (Karl Brugger, <em>The Chronicle of Akakor</em>. New York: Delacorte Press, 1977, p.58)</td>
<td>And they [the <strong>ships of Solomon</strong> &amp; Hiram] came to <strong>OPHIR</strong> and fetched from thence gold. Once every three years came the navy… bringing <strong>gold and silver</strong>… [so that Solomon] made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones. (1 Kings 9:28; 10:11,22,27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ships came from the east across the ocean to the mouth of the Amazon in South America.</td>
<td>1. Solomon’s ships sailed west from Tyre, and across the Atlantic to South America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. These ships came from Samon’s empire.</td>
<td>2. These ships were sent by King Solomon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. These ships came to Ofir.</td>
<td>3. These ships went to Ophir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gold and silver left Ofir.</td>
<td>4. Gold and silver left Ophir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This happened about 3,166 BC to 2,866 BC.</td>
<td>5. This happened during 970 to 931 BC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let’s repeat the main ingredients of these two accounts:
It stretches credibility to imagine that both the Hebrews far away in the Middle East, and this remote Amazon tribe, could each independently make up such matching details.

Obviously they are speaking of the same event. The strongest matching link is the name Ofir (Ophir). There can be no doubt that these are one and the same. Scholars have sought in vain for a confirmed geographical location for Ophir in the time of Solomon. At best, they have come up only with speculated locations. But speculation is not evidence. In no physical place on earth has this name cropped up except here – in South America. (See Appendix 3.)

The strength of the name is one thing. But take the first four details together and you have not a single thread, but several factors which, entwined together, form a rope. The laws of probably are highly against the two reports describing a separate event. (With all the possible differences of names and circumstances, the chances of those four particular details matching are calculated at 16 billion to one)

WHAT ABOUT THE DISPARITY OF DATES?

The only factor that needs to be aligned is the dating. However, this should not be difficult.

Firstly, we have already established that for the general date for the Great Flood and the subsequent rise of civilizations, at least
16 witnesses around the world (plus the biblical dating) are in agreement. That is a formidable parade of witnesses. And the biblical dating is secure. You don’t have to be an archaeologist to see it.

Yes, I know. There will be some shouts of protest. My challenge is this: Produce a better array of witnesses than these – or keep quiet.

Secondly, the UM Chronicle dating is disparate. However, it can no longer stand in isolation, but must be assessed within the framework of these 17 other witnesses.

The weight of evidence suggests that the time frame for Samon and Ofir needs to be corrected to the period 970 to 931 BC.

ISRAELI FIND CONFIRMS THE DATING FOR THE SOUTH AMERICAN “OFIR”

Unexpected confirmation of the correct time period for the South American Ofir (Ophir) comes from Gene Savoy, who achieved international fame with the discovery of the lost city of Vilcabamba, one of the most dramatic and important archaeological finds of the 20th century.

In the winter of 1966, Savoy found in Amazonas, Peru, a series of figures inscribed on the wall of an ancient tomb. High up in the Andes, in the region of the legendary Chachapoyas, the largest and most imposing of the glyphs resembled a figure that Savoy knew to be of Middle Eastern origin. He translated the glyph as saying “Ophir”.

After Savoy had discovered that enigmatic glyph in the Andes, another inscription appeared, but this time in Israel, at Tel
Qasile, an ancient site near Tel Aviv that dates from King Solomon's time. The inscription, on a potsherd unearthed by archaeologists, bears this message in Phoenician-Hebrew:

Gold of Ophir, the possession of Beth-Horon, thirty shekels.

The inscription once marked a pot of gold stored in the hold of an ancient Phoenician merchant ship.

At its centre was the same symbol Savoy had found cut into the cliff face of the mountain in South America.

Do you see the significance of these two finds – the first in South America and the second in Israel?

1. The source of the gold sold at the seaport of Ofir was the mines of the Andes region.

2. This same Andes region is where the “Ophir” glyph was found.

3. This links the Andes Ophir with the Ofir seaport at the mouth of the Amazon.

4. The Andes Ophir glyph and the Israel “Ophir” inscription are a precise match.

5. The Israel Ophir belongs to the time of Solomon, 971 to 930 BC.

6. Therefore, the Andes Ophir and the Ofir seaport may be reasonably dated to the same period, 971 to 930 BC.

This is the most likely scenario.

But that now prompts us to look at another aspect of the Amazon tribe’s chronology.
THE “12,000” YEARS CLAIM

With the insights we now possess concerning the records of Egypt, Sumeria and other ancient cultures, we might ask, how should one regard the Ugha Mongulala tribe’s reported chronology of 12,000 plus years?

The answer, of course, is that we should approach it with a cautious scientific mind. It is well to remember that, due to the major difficulties in physically reaching this tribe, no scientific examination of the Ugha Mongulala chronology has ever been undertaken.

RULES TO REMEMBER IN ASSESSING AN ANCIENT DOCUMENT

From the errors we have made with other “stretched” histories, there have emerged at least 16 guidelines to bear in mind, should we ever be able to test the “12,000 year” claim.

1. It is vital to be aware that many ancient scribes deliberately exaggerated their nations’ ages. (See Chapter 10.)

2. Over time, certain crucial words within the same language can change their meanings, so that later descendants misunderstand certain words that they are reading. One could cite many examples of this from English documents no older than a few hundred years. Example: In past generations, the word “gay” was commonly used to mean happy, but today it more often means homosexual.

3. When a person’s name and title both appear in the record, they can be inadvertently listed separately as though they were different persons. We have already seen how this one factor misled historians into thinking Egypt had a longer history.
4. Several names belonging to the same person can be mistakenly listed one after another. Again, the Egypt dating blunder is a good example.

5. Two men ruling at the same time over different parts of the kingdom can be wrongly listed as following one another. Once, more the Egypt dating mistake comes to mind.

6. An extra zero mistakenly added to a number can multiply it ten-fold. Example: See our discussion in Chapter 17 regarding the Atlantis controversy.

7. One letter added to or subtracted from a single word can change the meaning of a sentence. Scribal mistakes of this kind are common in ancient manuscripts. To give an example in our English language: The word “amoral” means NOT based on moral standards. But without the “a” you have “moral” which means “based on moral standards” – quite an opposite meaning. “He loved the dessert” (sweet dish) is very different from “he loved the desert” (arid wasteland).

8. An incorrect letter in a word – for example, shade instead of spade. In our computer age we call this a typing mistake. In earlier days it was simply a scribal error.

9. A correct letter in the wrong place in a word – for example, arm for ram.

10. A single punctuation mark in the wrong place can alter the meaning of a sentence. Example: “I tell you today, you will become manager here” (I’m telling you now) is so different from “I tell you, today you will become manager here.” (It will happen today)

11. An accidental space between two letters can drastically change the meaning. For example, “a verse” can mean a poem, while “averse” means unwilling. An atheist will say “God is
nowhere”, while a believer will say “God is now here”. Do you see the difference? Amazing how just one tiny empty space can give a sentence such an opposite meaning!

12. A word spelled wrongly, because it was confused with another word having the same sound. Example, spelling it as there when their is intended.

13. Two words in the wrong order (or a word misplaced) in a sentence can give the whole sentence an entirely different meaning. Example: “With his helper Jack found the lost dog” can be read differently from “Jack found the lost dog with his helper.” A writer may be trying to say that Jack and his helper found the dog, while the reader thinks that Jack found both the dog and his helper together. Such misunderstandings in human communication are commonplace.

14. The same word can have two different meanings. Example: “hold the mouse” (belonging to the computer), or “hold the mouse” (the animal) – Centuries later, this distinction between two uses of the same word will very likely be misunderstood.

We saw earlier, in the Sumerian king list, just how one word with two different values can be misread by scholars who are sure they have it right – where 2,221 years got stretched to 432,000 years!

In our day, the very same word “billion” has two different meanings. In the USA billion means one thousand times a million – 1,000,000,000, But in Britain “billion” means one million times a million – 1,000,000,000,000. Mistakes with numbers are not something new to investigators.

15. An idiom is a phrase that means something other than the words imply (for example, the English idiom “step on it” means “hurry”). Later translators and even contemporary foreigners will almost always get such a phrase wrong. Other examples are
“we must bite the bullet”, “she’s a square”, “he kicked the bucket” and so on.

16. Ambiguous sentence construction. For example, would you please answer this correctly?: If you have three apples and you take away two, how many do you have? Of course, the answer depends on how you understand the sentence construction. If you have three apples and you take away (mathematically subtract) two, there is just one apple left. On the other hand, if you start with three apples but as you physically depart you take two of them with you, then you have in your possession two apples.

WHAT ALL THIS MEANS

If old documents in one’s own language can be misunderstood, then we should not be surprised that top scholars have misread some ancient documents for decades before glaring mistakes were noticed – the result being a dramatically reduced timeline of history.

Remember Egypt’s chronology. Even though hundreds of scholars have been on the case, yet they still haven’t got Egypt’s dating right. (See Chapter 11.) And then there is the Sumerian king list, where 432,000 years became only 2221 years. (See Chapter 14)

As for this remote Amazon tribe, no scholar on earth has yet had opportunity to access its records. At this early stage, a court of law would classify them as hearsay. And, ultimately, the finding of just one human error could bring their supposed “12,000 year” history crashing down.

I predict that when a thorough and honest scrutiny of that tribe’s history is completed, we shall find it to be in harmony with the other nations of the world, whose recorded time-lines are in close parity with the Genesis time-line.
TO SUMMARISE THE AMAZON TRIBE’S DATING

Here are *three vital factors* that no honest scholar should dare dismiss:

1. On this whole planet, there is *not one atom of established evidence* for any worldwide cataclysm as early as 10,000 or 12,000 BC. Not anywhere. All the speculating, wishing and theorising to the contrary is not evidence.

2. *At least 17 witnesses* around the planet harmoniously testify that a *new beginning* for both natural processes and human activity occurred *close to 2000 BC*.

3. The Great Flood of *2345 BC* was so total in its effects that it marked *a clear break in history*. During this cataclysm, continent and ocean were churned up together and the earth’s crust was disrupted thousands of feet deep. The result? No civilization, even in an underground tunnel system, would have survived.

Seventeen physical, testable witnesses.

The Japanese say, “Like cords in a rope, each is individually strong, but when *interwoven* and used in a rope, the cords become stronger and even more powerful.”

Against this we have one alleged discordant, but unconfirmed tribal record.

Again, the Japanese would say, “A cloth is not woven from a single thread.”

Seventeen witnesses in agreement. And one in apparent disagreement. By the weight of evidence, which of these two alternatives is more likely to need correction? What do you
think?

I predict that, as with the Egyptian, and as with the Sumerian, so with this reported chronicle in the Amazon jungle – if it can ever be studied with true scientific rigour, its dating will be found to harmonise with the evidence from the rest of the world.
APPENDIX 1

THE ICE AGE
(From Jonathan Gray, The Corpse Came Back, chapter 17)

No bikini-clad beauties soaked up the sun on Tiahuanaco’s beaches. This Pacific seaport was as dreary as every other city on earth... at that time.

Don’t get me wrong. This was a city of startling dimensions. Giant buildings, imposing colonnades and lifelike statues of men and women in a thousand poses. There was partying, action and excitement.

But just go outside... How tiresome it must have been, seeing in the sky nothing but clouds - night and day! Generations of children grew up to endless heavy clouds, hanging low overhead. Dark nights. Dismal summers. And very stormy - all through the year.

The racial memory of the Cashinaua Indians of Brazil recalls the deafening thunder, the lightning and a “collapsed sky”. (R.W. Williamson, Religious and Cosmic Beliefs of Central Polynesia, 1933, Vol.1, p.41)

And the African Ovaherero tribe says the sky “fell down”. In fact, myths of this falling sky are found amongst the Celts, the Eskimos of Greenland, the Lapps of Finland, ancient peoples of Tibet, China and Mexico, as well as tribes of Samoa and western and eastern Africa.

In the aftermath of the Deluge, large areas of the oceans and seas would have boiled and steamed.
Massive evaporation of the waters inevitably resulted in the formation of thickening cloud cover.

The general release of heat, smoke and dust initiated atmospheric pollution that would last for decades.

And the sheer weight of this polluted atmosphere would have forced the cloud base down to unprecedented low levels.

Much of the high latitudes of Earth were enveloped in a gloomy shroud.

An Australian Aboriginal legend tells how “in those days the sky was close to the ground and everything, both man and beast, crept and crawled on the earth; and only stunted shrubs covered the land” - until Yondi the warrior “raised the sky”. (Roman Black, “The Story of the Boomerang,” *Old and New Australian Aboriginal Art*)

The clouds were so thick that when they were dispersed one day, men discovered the stars - the stars that they had never seen before.

A South American tradition recalls that Tiahuanaco existed before the stars. Before the stars? Absurd, of course. That is, if we take it literally. But not so absurd if we imagine that in the not too distant past men had seen the cloud cover dissolve and a star-strewn sky sparkling above them for the first time.

And so the stars became visible again!

According to the Aztecs, “There had been no sun in existence for many years… [The Chiefs] began to peer through the gloom in all directions for the expected sight, and to make bets as to what part of heaven [the sun] should first appear… but when the sun rose, they were all proved wrong, for not one of them had fixed upon the east.” (Immanuel Velikovsky, *Worlds in Collision*, p.131)
Why no sun and no stars? Actually, it was the same thing that caused the Ice Age… and why did the sun rise in a new direction? That will follow.

**ICE AGE**

A glacial period came on suddenly.

The origin of glaciation (contributing to an ice age or ages) has been explained by changes in temperature in the past.

But what on earth caused it? There is plenty of speculation. Sixty different theories, in fact. But to the uniformitarian (evolutionist) the cause of the Ice Age remains a “mystery”. As Reginald Daly puts it:

> At present the cause of excessive ice making on the lands remains a baffling mystery, a major question for the future reader of earth's riddles. (R.A. Daly, *The Changing world of the Ice Age*, p.16)

Charles H. Hapgood admits:

> We do not have an integrated, effective theory of the earth we live on… [in the last 100 years] at least fifty theories have been produced to explain the ‘ice ages’ but none of them has been satisfactory. (Charles H. Hapgood. “The Earth’s Shifting Crust”, *Saturday Evening Post*, Jan. 10, 1959)

No theory has been able to explain why an Ice Age failed to occur in the coldest place on earth (northeastern Siberia), yet laid areas of ice over parts of warmer latitudes.

**NO SUFFICIENT CAUSE, EXCEPT…**

The truth is, there is no cause that could sufficiently lower the temperature to produce an Ice Age - apart from thick clouds of
dust enveloping the earth to keep out the sun’s rays. And that calls for global catastrophe (which is against uniformism, the basis of evolution).

To complicate the problem, adherents of the Ice Age theory have been forced to suggest several Ice Ages, in an effort to account for various “mystery” phenomena.

However, such mysteries vanish when we realize this: Marks which are supposed to be evidence of ice are explained more easily as evidence of flood water.

If we consider all the evidence, the most reasonable view is that there was one Ice Age, which followed the Great Flood.

But unfortunately, evolutionary geologists resist the Great Flood concept. You ask, why? Because a Flood-based geology destroys the essential uniformitarianism basis of the theory of evolution. One cannot logically believe in the global Flood and also believe in evolution.

**HEAT NECESSARY**

One vital ingredient needed for an Ice Age would be heat. John Tyndall, a nineteenth century British physicist, understood this:

> The enormous extension of glaciers in bygone ages demonstrates, just as rigidly, the operation of heat as well as the action of cold. Cold [alone] will not produce glaciers. (John Tyndall, *Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion*. 1883, pp.191-192)

The thickness of ice which formed on the land is estimated at 6,000 to 12,000 feet! The amount of water contained in so much ice is enough to have required the ocean level to be 300 feet lower than now.
To originally evaporate so much water (which was redeposited as ice) an enormous amount of HEAT was necessary.

Tyndall demonstrated that the same amount of heat necessary to melt 5 pounds of cast iron is required to produce one pound of vapour. Thus to evaporate water into clouds that would fall as snow and ice, there was needed a quantity of heat sufficient to melt a mass of 5 of iron times greater than the mass of ice.

Without such enormous heat, said Tyndall, there could have been no Ice Age. Even if the sun disappeared and the earth lost its heat to outer space, the oceans and water bodies would freeze, but there could have been no ice formation on LAND.

Astronomer D. Manzel of the Harvard Observatory, referring to the so-called “ice ages”, preferred to think that “increased warmth brought them on, whereas a diminution caused them to stop.” (D. Manzel, Our Sun. 1950, p.248)

**ICE FROM HEAT!**

The bottom line is this: Large stretches of the earth and its oceans must have been heated as a furnace; vast “areas” of ocean bottom must have bubbled with lava - both during the Flood and for some time later.

It was these post-Flood warm oceans that initiated the Ice Age.

**COLD ALSO NECESSARY**

But heat evaporation was not enough. Copious and rapid condensation of the vapours had to follow.

Tyndall explains:
We need a condenser so powerful that this vapour, instead of falling in liquid showers to the earth, shall be so far reduced in temperature as to descend as snow. (Tyndall, pp. 188-189)

Immanuel Velikovsky pinpoints the only conditions under which an Ice Age could have taken place:

An unusual sequence of events was necessary; the oceans must have steamed and the vaporised water must have fallen as snow in latitudes of temperate climates, This sequence of heat and cold must have taken place in quick succession. (Velikovsky, Earth in Upheaval. London: Sphere Books Ltd., 1978, p.121)

**CAUSE OF ICE = VOLCANOES**

Let us, then, observe what occurred as the Great Flood was subsiding.

As intimated earlier, the Great Flood was a cosmic catastrophe, involving an estimated 30,000 volcanoes, which shook and tore at the foundation of the earth, roaring with incessant thunder, belching forth dust, steam, boulders and lava - and lighting up the darkened sky with their terrifying and lurid flames.

This is not imagination. The rocks of our earth show that it happened.

And even after the Flood, volcanic activity persisted. This intense volcanism produced dust, which effectively reduced the sun’s radiation.

Day and night, the whole planet was enveloped in a cloud covering as thick as that of Venus. The dense cloud of steam and dust deflected the sun’s heat away from the earth. Atmospheric temperature dropped.
Interestingly, volcanic dust is said to be 30 times more effective in shutting out solar radiation than in keeping terrestrial heat in. A mean temperature drop today of 5 degrees Fahrenheit (if moisture conditions were favourable) would cause great areas of ice to form on mountains and tablelands of the earth's temperate zones.

**MODERN EXAMPLES**

After studying the records of three centuries, Dr. W.J. Humphrey of the U.S. Weather Bureau compiled a report showing that, virtually without exception, periods of volcanic activity were followed by cool and rainy summers.

- Volcanic activity from 1500 to 1912 is believed to have lowered the earth’s temperature 2 or 3 degrees. Polar Sea ice grew sufficiently to block off Greenland; European glaciers overran small villages. Since then, with fewer major eruptions, the climate has warmed up.

- In April, 1815, Tambora Volcano in Indonesia exploded, in one of history’s most violent eruptions. A year later (the usual time lag) record low temperatures were felt in various places. That was a year without summer.

- After the 1883 Krakatoa eruption, dust particles suspended in the atmosphere almost worldwide reduced the normal amount of solar radiation for THREE YEARS or more, by 15 percent.

- When Mount Katmai in Alaska erupted on June 8, 1912, the thermometer fell 10-12 degrees Celsius as far away as Algeria. According to meteorologist W. Humphrey, the effect was to diminish by 20 percent the amount of heat received by the earth from the sun. In some parts of
America, they did not see the sun for 40 days. L. Don Leet, in *Encyclopedia Americana*, referring to this event, says: “If it were effective for a long enough period of time such a fall (of temperature) would bring a large section of the present temperate zones within a region of year-round ice.” (L. Don Leet, *Encyclopedia Americana*, vol.28, art. “Volcano”, 1983 ed).

*Adelaide Advertiser, Australia, news report*

**COMBINATION OF CAUSES**

At the close of the Deluge:

1. Large quantities of stranded water filled all low continental areas.
2. Volcanic activity evaporated enormous quantities of water into steam clouds.
3. It also produced dust, which reduced solar-radiation and lowered temperatures.
4. The cold air and warm oceans caused heavy precipitation of snow and ice.
**VOLCANIC WINTER**

Falling again and again in a sunless world, the snow finally cooled the ground to the point where it could turn to ice.

As a result, snow rapidly piled up in the mountains and formed glaciers. And millions of square miles of ice formed over areas of land. Earth experienced a “volcanic winter”.

It was freezing and wet. Snowfall continued through winter and summer alike, uninterrupted for years.

Glaciers pushed down into the valleys and scoured the landscape. Glaciers ground rocks into powder which was spread over the landscape by melt water.

When it dried, winds lifted the powder and dropped it to form loess deposits, such as are found, for example, in Mississippi.

This Ice Age, as it is called, set in before the break-up into continents. (See *The Corpse Came Back*, Chapter 2.)

**RAIN TOO**

In the counter-action between heat and cold, snow would fall in some areas of the earth and torrential rain elsewhere. And this is just what scientists have found from their field studies.

This Ice Age, as we term it, set in before the break-up of the super-continent, and spread into Antarctica after that region was wrenched southward.

Historical and archaeological evidence shows that Antarctica escaped a continental freeze-over for some centuries, during which period human colonies, apparently, were established. (Jonathan Gray, *Dead Men’s Secrets*, pp.24-27)
The peopling of the Americas as well as Antarctica took place amazingly soon after the Flood.

According to Polynesian traditions, there was a time when Antarctica was not covered with ice, and several nations inhabited it. (Francis Maziere, Mysteries of Easter Island. New York: Tower Publications, Inc., 1965)

Antarctica was settled before the continents became separated. But with the wrenching apart of the continental mass, the upthrusting of mountain ranges and the rifting, severe climatic changes came to Antarctica. The location of the poles had altered. And both Arctic and Antarctic regions, cut off from the heat of the sun, were plunged into a prolonged night of devastating cold.

Although it took some time for ice cover to advance, the Antarctica civilisation was destroyed by the expanding walls of ice.

SEVERAL ICE AGES OR JUST ONE?

Here’s another puzzle that has uniformitarian geologists scratching their heads:

_A worldwide warm climate_ seems to be indicated in practically every _so-called “age”_ in the geological fossil column. Yet there is the _“Ice Age” in the most RECENT portion_ of that column, the Pleistocene epoch.

“But,” I hear someone say, “there’s evidence of earlier ice ages - the Permian ice age and the ones in the pre-Cambrian.”

Well, that statement deserves our attention. So let’s see.

Okay, first of all, we should note that striated bedrock and conglomerates are often quoted as being indicators of glaciation.
But these may be produced by causes other than glaciers - for example, FLOODS. For instance, 55 thousand million cubic metres of coarse sedimentary rock in Australia was formerly interpreted as a ‘tillite’ originally deposited in an ancient glacial period. However, these have now been shown to have been formed by underwater mud flows. (J.F. Lindsay, “Carboniferous Subaqueous Mass-movement in the Manning-Macleay Basin, Kempsey, New South Wales”, *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology*, vol.36, pp.719-732, 1966)

But, despite this, some academics will dig in their heels and insist on several Ice Ages. Why? Because they don’t want to face the implications of a global Flood. Honestly, you have only that choice - several Ice Ages, or a worldwide Flood. (The Global Flood, you see, pulls away the mat from under the evolution theory. I explain how in *Surprise Witness*.)

When you consider the requirements we have just discovered which are necessary to produce just one Ice Age, it becomes obvious: Surely, several periods of worldwide glaciation would require a miracle (or series of miracles) greater than that needed to bring on the global Flood.

To accomplish some of the feats demanded of ice by those who insist on these Ice Ages, ice would not only have had to climb high mountains 3,000 to 4,000 feet higher than itself against gravity, but it would need to act contrary to all laws of nature seen in action today.

Be sure of this. Uniformitarian causes are totally inadequate. The result is an almost INSOLUBLE problem.

On the other hand, there is good scientific basis for suggesting that the supposed evidence for these presumed “Ice Ages” (especially the “earlier” ones) could be better explained by water action. (John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1961, pp.247-249,292-310)
However, I shall grant this: the glacial till from the “last” ice sheet is of a different type from the others. This one probably does indicate true ice conditions.

During this one Ice Age, volcanic dust was also blowing in from time to time to interbed with the ice. From one direction a shower of snow might blow in, followed by a layer of volcanic ash from another direction. One might also expect oxygen levels, like other factors during those centuries, to be unstable and variable.

**SHORT-LIVED ICE AGE**

But evidence strongly suggests that this one and only Ice Age was short-lived. Assumptions of long periods of glaciation are not provable by dating methods, states Frederick Johnson, writing with Willard Libby, the most recognised authority on carbon dating. (Willard F. Libby, *Radiocarbon Dating*. 1955, p.148)

Evidence from a number of authorities suggests that the glacial period ended “abruptly”. Wallace S. Broeker, Maurice Ewing and Bruce C. Heezen speak of the “rapid ice retreat” and “the warming which occurred at the close of Wisconsin glacial times” as “extremely abrupt”. (“Evidence for an Abrupt Change in Climate Close to 11,000 Years Ago”, *American Journal of Science*, vol.258, June 1960, pp.441,429)

**HOW LONG AGO WAS THE ICE AGE?**

The French scholar Francois Forel thought that the ice sheet of the last glacial period began to melt 12,000 years ago. This was estimated from the deposits of detritus carried by glacial rivers and deposits in lakes.

But Velikovsky notes that “the mud must have assembled on the
bottom of a lake at a faster rate in the beginning when the
glaciers were larger, and if the Ice Age terminated suddenly, the
deposition of detritus would have been much heavier at first,
and there would be little analogy to the accumulation of detritus
from the seasonal melting of snow in the Alps. **Therefore the
time that has elapsed since the end of the last glacial period
must have been even shorter than reckoned.**” (Velikovsky, *Worlds

Let’s digress for a moment concerning Antarctica. I saw in an
encyclopaedia published in 1976, the confident and absolute
claim that ANTARCTICA had been under ice for 50 to 60
million years!

But in 1990 two geologists made a discovery that completely
reopened the question of the age of the ice-sheet. Working just
250 miles from the South Pole, the geologists discovered the
frozen remains of forest that was later dated to be between 2 and
3 million years old.

That encyclopaedia was wrong by as much as 58 million years!
The absolute, ancient age of the Antarctic ice-cap wasn’t so
absolute after all.

In fact, C.H. Hopgood had already announced that Iconium
dating of cores taken from the bottom of the Ross Sea showed
that the “most recent” Ice Age in Antarctica **began** no more than
6,000 years ago. (C.H. Hapsgood, in an article in *Saturday Evening Post*, 1959. Cited

With what we now know, even 6,000 years ago is too far
back. But, at least Hapgood was much closer to the truth
than the “millions of years” merchants.

No, it doesn’t take long for ice to build up.

A pole erected early last century in the Australian Antarctic
Territory is reported to be now covered in ice over 100 feet deep.
Similarly, not much time would be required for an Ice Age to end.

**WITNESSES RECORDED IT**

In this connection, I shall mention again some very ancient maps. In *Dead Men's Secrets*, we noted that these maps were drawn by surveying parties who used longitude, latitude and a spherical earth map projection system. The maps indicate that those early explorers possessed a knowledge of cartography comparable to our own; they knew the correct shape and size of the earth; and they must have had at their disposal advanced geodetic instruments. In short, they were sophisticated.

According to the maps, survey expeditions that roamed the planet began to record ominous changes in both of the polar regions.

These maps, the origins of which are thousands of years old, show Antarctica firstly free of ice, secondly, the centre of Antarctica beginning to fill with ice (rivers and fjords being shown where today mile-thick glaciers flow) and thirdly, Antarctica after it had become mostly covered in ice. The U.S. Hydrographic Office declared one of these maps to be over 5,000 years old. (Gray, *Dead Men's Secrets*, pp.24-30) Not quite correct, but they were close.

Similar ancient maps show Greenland before it was covered in ice; glacial actions in the Baltic countries; and northern Europe being covered by the Ice Age glaciation's furthest advance. They were recording it as it occurred! Undoubtedly with sophisticated mapping instruments!

Physical evidence documented by Velikovsky suggests the Ice Age occurred only 4- to 5,000 years ago. (Velikovsky, *Earth in Upheaval*. Chapter entitled “Thirty-five Centuries Ago”) This overlaps the date of the
Great Flood (4,355 years ago), which was the catalyst for the Ice Age.

The unshaded and encircled area represents regions of South America, Africa, Antarctica and Australia thought to have been once covered by a common ice sheet.

Map: after David W. Unfred

The above map illustrates this interesting fact: **Before** the final tearing apart of the continents, the Ice Age had begun.

Temperatures were dropping.

The book of Job, so far as we can ascertain, is the oldest surviving book in the world. From the various astronomical references in the book, different astronomers claim to be able to calculate the time in which Job lived, which they give as from 2200-2100 BC. (*Miracle in Stone*, pp.203-206)

In his Ice Age book, Job recorded that “the waters [of the sea] harden like stone, and the surface of the deep [ocean] is frozen.”

(Job 38:29,30)
As immense ice sheets came to cover Europe, at the same time in the Middle East, hail, snow and storms would be frequent. And the sea froze over in winter.

The later receding of the ice sheets over northern Europe seems to have been witnessed by some of its earliest colonists, who have left intriguing records for us to discover.

One example that can be dated with fair precision relates to Partholan’s coming to Ireland (15th century BC). He counted “but three laughs [lochs, or lakes] and nyne Rivers in the Kingdom.” But then, during the later second colonisation of Ireland, we are told that “Many Laughs and Rivers broke out in their time.” (The Irish Annals of Clonmacnoise, tr. into English in 1627 by Connell Mageoghagan. Dublin: University Press, 1896, Murphy ed., pp.13,15)

Let’s face it. Lakes and rivers don’t just suddenly ‘break out’ in a short period of time without a source of water that is truly vast. So it would seem, therefore, that we are given in the early Irish records an intriguing glimpse into the melting of the north European ice-sheets which occurred some short time after the 15th century BC.

The Britons did not settle under Brutus in those islands until some three hundred years later (c.1104 BC), which is doubtless why their records contain no allusions to ice or a sudden burgeoning of rivers and lakes as do the earlier Irish accounts.
APPENDIX 2

ANCIENT MAPS

I would like to introduce to you more than a dozen amazing maps, all from the Medieval and Renaissance period.

The first is the Zeno map, drawn in 1380. It outlines the coasts of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Scotland, as well as the exact latitude and longitude of a certain number of islands.

Someone may object, But wasn’t the chronometer, necessary to determine longitude, not invented until 1765?

That’s right, and that is why the readings of Columbus were all inaccurate.

Nevertheless, the Zeno map is most accurate, And it will be noticed that on this map the topography of Greenland is shown free of glaciers as it was prior to the Ice Age. Unknown rivers and mountains shown on this Zeno map have since been located in probes of the French Polar Expedition of 1947-1949.

And there is the Camerio map of 1502, formed on a spherical grid.

Now, someone will remind me, in the Middle Ages they thought the earth was flat. Are we certain these are not modern fakes?

No chance of a mistake, I assure you. But have you heard of the Zauche map of 1737? It shows Antarctica free of ice.
Impossible, you may think. Antarctica’s existence was not verified until 1819!

Nevertheless, this map does show that continent—and completely free of ice to boot. Surprisingly, it is shown not as one continent but two islands separated by a strait from the Ross to the Weddell Seas (a fact which was not established until the Geophysical Year, 1968). Also shown are islands of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, now known to lie on the bottom of the ocean.

There exists another map drawn in 1531 by Orontius Fineus, in which the dimensions of the Antarctic land mass correspond very closely to those on the best modern maps. The map indicates that the centre of Antarctica was beginning to fill with ice when its source maps were drawn. It shows rivers and fjords in Antarctica where today mile-thick glaciers flow.

Next is the Mercator chart of 1569; it depicts only the Antarctic coast left uncovered by glaciers.

These are Renaissance maps. But these particular maps are infinitely superior to the regular maps made at that time. Now I’ll share a secret. You see, many of the Medieval and Renaissance mapmakers admitted they were copying from sources whose origins were unknown.

These maps are a scientific achievement far surpassing the abilities of the navigators and mapmakers of the Renaissance, Middle Ages, the Arab world, or any ancient geographers. They are the product of an unknown people antedating recognized history.

Another very exciting map, copied in 1559, is the The Hadji Ahmed map. It shows Antarctica and the Pacific coast of the United States of America with extreme accuracy. It also depicts the land bridge that once existed between Siberia and Alaska.
The Andrea Benincasa map (1508) indicates that Northern Europe was being covered by the Ice Age glaciation’s furthest advance.

Next, there is the Iehudi Ibn ben Zara map of 1487. It shows remnants of glaciers in Britain. And also the detailed profiles of islands in the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas. Those islands are still there—but now under water.

The Hamy King chart (1502) indicates northern Siberian rivers emptying into the Arctic Ocean (but which are now all under ice). It also shows glacial actions in the Baltic countries. What are today huge islands in Southeast Asia are shown on this map joined to land (which they once were). And you know what? The map even shows an ancient Suez Canal!

Ptolemy’s map of the North depicts a glacial sheet advancing across south-central Greenland; and at the same time it shows glaciers retreating from northern Germany and southern Sweden.

The Orontius Fineus map. Its greatest error is that Antarctica is drawn too large, possibly a copyist’s mistake, although mountains and other details, not rediscovered until 1958, are accurately presented.
Do you see? This all could only have come from the findings `of surveying parties that tracked the areas before, during and after the Ice Age.

During the Ice Age, according to the evolutionary theory, humans were grunting savages.

The *Gloreanus map (1510)* shows not only the exact line of the Atlantic coast of America from Canada to Tierra del Fuego, but also the whole length of the Pacific coast.

The *King Jaime World Chart (1502)* shows the Sahara Desert as a fertile land with large lakes, rivers and cities (which, at a remote period, it was).

Then there’s the *Dulcert map of 1339*, tracing from Ireland to the Don River of Eastern Europe; I tell you, this map shows precision beyond understanding.

But there’s one more. Its a beauty. This is the *Piri Reis chart of 1513*. After its discovery, Captain Arlington H. Mallery, an American authority on cartography, asked the U.S. Hydrographic Office to examine it. The U.S. Navy, through Commander Larsen, subsequently issued this statement:
The Hydrographic Office of the Navy has verified an ancient chart—it’s called the Piri Reis map, that goes back more than 5,000 years. It’s so accurate, only one thing could explain it—a worldwide survey. The Hydrographic Office couldn’t believe it, either, at first. But they not only proved the map genuine, it’s been used to correct errors in some present-day maps.

If ever there were a treasure map, this is it. Just crammed with priceless gems. It tells the story of ancient coastlines, as well as the surprising exploits of our ancestors five thousand years ago.

Piri Reis stated that his copy was a composite from twenty ancient maps. It contains the following features:

1. South America and Africa in correct relative longitude and latitude. Not only were the Caribbean, Spanish, African and South American coasts in correct positions relative to each other, but even isolated land areas, like Cape Verde Island, the Azores, the Canary Islands, as well as topographies of the interiors—mountain ranges, peaks, rivers, plateaus. All were accurately positioned by longitude and latitude.

2. The coastline of Queen Maud Land in Antarctica. The islands and bays of the depicted coastline are the same as they appear below the Antarctic ice sheet (as recently revealed by seismic echo soundings). Pictured in great detail are regions scarcely explored today, including a mountain range that remained undiscovered until 1952. Interestingly, the map shows two bays where the modern seismic map showed lands. However, when the experts were asked to check their measurements, they found that the ancient map was correct, after all. One thing was crystal clear. Either somebody had mapped Antarctica before the ice cap covered the continent, or else the ice-covered continent was mapped with very sophisticated instruments.
3. The Isle of Pines, Andros Island, San Salvador, Jamaica, the mouth of the Amazon and the island of Morajo are all correctly shaped and perfectly located in latitude and longitude.

4. A major error appeared to be Greenland, shown as three islands. But during the International Geophysical Year it was proved that this correctly represented the state of affairs about 3000 BC.

5. Every mountain range in northern Canada and Alaska was recorded on this ancient map—including some ranges which the U.S. Army Map Services did not have on their maps. But the U.S. Army has since found them!

6. The ancient source-maps were drawn using a circular grid based on spherical trigonometry, with the focal point situated in Egypt. The copiest Piri Reis (unfamiliar with circular projection) shifted and spliced the original grid to compensate for the curvature. Any modern spheroid projection on a flat surface would cause the same distortion.

Clearly it came from an advanced ancient technology and its grid system is similar to air navigation maps.

Even so, we cannot know how many times it was imperfectly copied.

The Piri Reis map projection was based on an overestimate of 4½ degrees in the circumference of the earth. Only one geographer in the ancient world had made that overestimation: the Greek Eratosthenes.

When the Piri Reis map is redrawn to correct the Eratosthenes error, all existing longitude errors on the map are thereby reduced to almost zero.
This can mean only one thing. The Greeks who mapped according to Eratosthenes’ circumference had before them source maps which had been drawn without that error. Thus, the geographical knowledge on which the Piri Reis map is based ultimately originated not with the Greeks but with an earlier people who possessed a more advanced science of mapmaking than even the Greeks!

While Greece and Rome were developing new civilizations, the vestiges of an older one, seemingly worldwide in scope, was vanishing. It left these maps, which were partly incomprehensible. So later cartographers altered them.

There’s just one more thing. The evidence indicates that what we have here is only part of an original world map.

Here, then, is evidence of science in an early epoch, which is considered to have had none. Here were physical fragments of the amazing knowledge of a super culture long vanished.

Here are six facts which are now apparent concerning those early explorers:

1. They possessed a knowledge of cartography comparable to our own.
2. They knew the correct shape and size of the earth.
3. They used spherical trigonometry in their mathematical measurements.
4. They utilized ultramodern methods of projection (exact coordinates).
5. They must have had at their disposal advanced geodetic instruments (and trained specialists to use them) to measure longitude and latitude (totally lost and not developed in the modern world until the end of the 18th century).
6. They must have been organized and directed on a global scale.
The Piri Reis map, dated 1513 but compiled from world maps of ancient times.

For comparison a global projection based on Cairo, compiled from NASA sources. Copy of the Hadji Ahmed globe.
APPENDIX 3

THE OPHIR VOYAGES

Around the 15th century BC, two powers were taking possession of the land on the eastern Mediterranean coast. About the same time as the Hebrew (Israelite) nation was coming into Palestine, another power was being established on the sea coast adjacent to the north, a people whose career was definitely marked out for them.

It was the destiny of Phoenicia that she should become to the ancient world in material things, what the Hebrew had become in spiritual things.

Phoenicia was the great manufacturing nation of the ancient world. Her dyed textiles, glass technology, superb stonework, ceramics and gem engraving were unsurpassed.

Indeed, L.A. Waddell (citing Sir Flinders Petrie) asserts that the Phoenicians “had a civilization equal or superior to that of Egypt, in taste and skill..., luxury far beyond that of the Egyptians, and technical work which could teach them rather than be taught.” (L.A.Waddell, *Phoenician Origin of the Britons, Scots and Anglo-Saxons*. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd 1924, p.220. P.H.E. 2.146)

The city of Tyre was the London of antiquity, the centre of a vast global trading network.
MISTRESS OF THE SEAS

Phoenicia, mistress of the seas, sent ships to all ports and traversed all oceans. From the thirteenth century BC she was the dominant naval and commercial power. Her mercantile operations were enormous. This great naval power had the trade of the planet in her hands. She was a great distributing nation; her people were the carriers of the world.

The famous Indian epic, the *Mahabharata*, states that:

> The able Panch (Phoenicians) setting out to invade the Earth, brought the whole world under their sway. (*Mahabharata*, Indian epic of the Great Barats. Book 1, ch.94, sloka 3738)

They were termed "leaders of the Earth". (Waddell, p.1, quoting, Rig Veda Hymn)

And Phoenicia was, in the 10\textsuperscript{th} to 11\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC as great as Babylon or Egypt.

The coasts and islands of the Mediterranean were rapidly covered with colonies. Today’s "Venice" preserves the ethnic title of "Phoenicia".

The Straits of Gibraltar were passed and cities built on the shores of the Atlantic. They founded Gades (Cadiz) on Spain’s west coast, 2,500 miles from Tyre, as the starting point for the Atlantic trade.

In the expanding range of their voyages, Phoenician ships out of Spain were battling the wild Atlantic en route to the tin of Cornwall and even to Norway (2,000 miles beyond Gades).

Eastward, there is evidence that Phoenicia built factories on the Persian Gulf and traded as far as Ceylon.
SOPHISTICATED INSTRUMENTS

Phoenician ships probed ever further. Navigation across open ocean was no problem to these explorers.

Due to the insufficient attention paid to this aspect of the subject, we have tended to belittle the size and sophistication of Phoenician shipping.

If we conceive of it as represented by types of marine craft as outlined on Phoenician coins and tombs, we shall not be able to suppose that the nation was ever employed on such voyages as those that shall shortly engage our attention.

There is evidence that they had the benefit of sophisticated instruments and large, fast, modern vessels carrying over 500 people. (Thomas Crawford Johnston, *Did the Phoenicians Discover America?* London: James Nisbet and Co., Ltd, 1913, pp. 70-104, 289. Compare with Jonathan Gray’s *Dead Men’s Secrets*, 1996, pp. 77-81)

This will be a surprise to many readers.

“SHIPS OF TARSHISH”

The type of vessel built especially for ocean travel was designated "ship of Tarshish" to distinguish it from the smaller craft which merely plied the eastern Mediterranean.

The name of the original Tarshish (in Spain) became displaced as the horizon of the Phoenician navigators moved westward.

Herodotus records a Phoenician clockwise circumnavigation of Africa about 600 BC, on behalf of Pharaoh Necho — a distance of 13,000 miles. Herodotus sniffed at their report that the sun was on their right, that is, to their north. (Herodotus *History of Herodotus*. iv:42. Edited by George Rawlinson. London: Murray, 1875)
This establishes the fact that Phoenician nautical prowess and daring was at a level not to be seen in modern times until the century of Columbus.

It is only due to the proud announcement of the Pharaoh who sponsored the trip that we know of this voyage. The Phoenicians were not publicists.

So what other trips were being made — from perhaps as early as 1200 BC?

**TO THE AMERICAS**

At La Venta, Mexico, was found a sculpture with distinctly Phoenician characteristics: bearded faces, upturned shoes, twisted rope borders and other details. It has been dated to around 850 BC. From Nicaragua to Mexico, on jade figurines, the backs of slate mirrors, funeral urns and other objects, appear bearded men who bear little resemblance to American Indians.

A well-known colony of Phoenicia was Carthage. An ancient historical work records the voyage of a convoy of as many as 60 ships, each carrying 550 people. This was around 500 BC. (Constance Irwin, *Fair Gods and Stone Faces*. London: W.H. Allen, 1964, pp.228,229,235)

Strabo writes that Phoenician colonies (300 colonies, he estimates) were planted prolifically well down the Atlantic coast of Africa. (*Strabo*, H.L. Jones transi. i.3.2)

From West Africa, it would be a simple matter to follow the trade winds to - you guessed it - South America.

To some, the idea that ancient mariners would have known the Americas may appear too ridiculous to consider, and it will be cast aside. But before such actions are taken, surely the evidence for this position should be carefully considered.

As Michael G. Bradley aptly put it, "The truth is just now being glimpsed by a handful of specialists - it is still almost

Voyages to the New World at around the time of King Solomon of Israel now seem more likely than not.

Some twelve years’ research for the book *Dead Men’s Secrets* finally convinced me that these colonists of a forgotten age were indeed part of a great network of ancient civilizations that once maintained a flourishing trade between Europe, Asia, and the Americas, some 3,000 years ago.

I should not have been surprised to discover that Harvard professor Dr Barry Fell, from his own research, had reached the same conclusion. He considered the ancient visitors to North America were probably not explorers, but rather merchants, trading with well-established fur trappers and very likely also mining precious metals on those sites where ancient workings have been discovered. (Barry Fell, *America B.C.: Ancient Settlers in the New World*. London: Wildwood House Ltd., 1978)

Fell states:

> Because of the depth of ignorance into which Europe fell during the Dark Ages, at times we are apt to forget how advanced were the ideas of the ancients, and how much they knew about the earth and about astronomy and navigation.

Fell is also convinced that “America shares a history with the Old World, and ancient Americans must have been well acquainted with much of that history as it took place.”

Dr Fell is now recognised as one of the world’s foremost epigraphers.
PHOENICIANS IN AMERICA?

In 1780, on a rock on the shores of Mount Hope Bay in Bristol, Rhode Island, there was discovered an inscription, which Fell deciphered in 1975 to read:

VOYAGERS FROM TARSHISH
THIS STONE PROCLAIMS (Fell, p.88)

This suggests strongly that here on the eastern seaboard of North America there was once a port for "ships of Tarshish".

On the island of Hispaniola, Columbus discovered immense ancient mines. In Haiti, he thought he could trace furnaces in which gold had been refined. (Bancroft, H.H. Works of Bancroft. San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft & Company, 1883, Vol. V, pp.64-65)

Between 1850 and 1910, travellers in the Amazon region and other parts of Brazil were reporting the finding of old inscriptions on rock faces.

Former rubber tapper Bernardo da Silva Ramos, in a now rare book in Portuguese, has published 1,500 reproductions from such rock carvings. They are all covered over with the letters of the Phoenician alphabet.

Investigator Pierre Honore discussing the finds of other Brazilian travellers and explorers of last century, states:

Today there is a whole library full of their reports; and they too were firmly convinced that the inscriptions were Phoenician texts. They were sure that King Solomon (975-935 BC) had once come to the Amazon with his ships; that the gold countries of Ophir, Tarshish and Parvaim were not to be looked for in the Old World at all, but here in the Amazon region on the Rio Solimoes, Solomon’s River. (Honore Pierre In Quest of the White God. London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd 1963. Transl. from the German by Oliver Coburn and Ursula Lehrburger, p.207. A more accurately fixed date for Solomon’s reign is 970 to 931BC)
It is reported that in Havea near Rio de Janeiro are letters several feet high inscribed upon a sheer cliff face in cuneiform. The inscription reads:

**BADEZIR OF THE PHOENICIAN TYRE.**

**THE FIRST SON OF JETHBAAL**

(L. Taylor Hansen, *He Walked the Americas*. Amherst,

(Jethbaal ruled Tyre from 887 to 856 BC.)

In 1872, on the coast of Brazil near Paraiba, Joaquim Alves da Costa found on his property a stone that bore numerous characters which no one understood. He copied them and sent them to the President of the Instituto Historico. A translation is as follows:

> We are Sidonian Canaanites from the city of the Merchant King. We were cast up on this distant island, a land of mountains. We sacrificed a youth to the celestial gods and goddesses in the nineteenth year of our mighty King Hiram and embarked from Ezion-geber into the Red Sea. We voyaged with ten ships and were at sea together for two years around Africa. Then we were separated by the hand of Baal and were no longer with our companions. So we have come here, twelve men and three women, into "Island of Iron". Am I, the Admiral, a man who would flee? Nay! May the celestial gods and goddesses favor us well.

This eight-line inscription proved to be in Phoenician characters. There are reasons to believe that the king referred to was Hiram III (553-533 BC). Brazil was known, anciently, as Hy Brasil. The incorporation of ‘I’ or ‘Hy’ is typically Phoenician.

According to Cyrus Gordon, Head of the Department of Mediterranean studies at Brandeis University, Massachusetts, the Phoenicians certainly knew Brazil, which they called "Island of Iron". Hy Brasil means "Island of Iron". Iron is still the country’s main resource.
When I first learned of this inscription, I was skeptical. Mention of it was omitted from my book *Dead Men’s Secrets*, since I preferred to publish only discoveries which could be confirmed beyond doubt as genuine. Others also considered it to be a fraud.

As we noted, at the time the alleged inscription was found, the script was not known. No one other than the original translator could read it. That has now changed.

Significantly, it contains Phoenician idiosyncrasies that were unknown in 1872 but which are now authenticated by other inscriptions found since.

Concerning many such initially rejected finds, Barry Fell says:

> One by one competent scholars who hold responsible positions in universities and museums are now coming forward with confirmations of the decipherments. (Cited by Violet Cummings in *Has Anybody Really Seen Noah’s Ark?* San Diego Ca.:Creation-Life Publishers, 1982, p.264)

**SHIPPING ROUTES WESTWARD AT FIRST**

The trend of Phoenician colonial development prior to 1000 BC was mainly in a westerly direction.

However, it is quite certain that they did not long rest satisfied with that.

With their overland routes to the east at risk from unrest in Babylonia, the Phoenicians gave careful attention to an alternative eastern route.

We know that Hiram I, king of Tyre, shared a friendship with Israel’s King David, and with his son Solomon.

As a result of a commercial treaty, Hiram assisted in the erection of Solomon’s Temple and Israel granted Phoenicia the two ports
of Eilat and Ezion-geber on the Gulf of Aqaba. (2 Chronicles ch.2; 1 Kings 9:26,27)

Like Gades in the west, the Persian Gulf colonies must now be viewed not as an end of Phoenician navigation in the east, but as the starting point for more distant navigation.

Fortunately, a mass of undigested historic data leaves no doubt concerning this fact.

**KING SOLOMON’S RIVER**

We find that the ships employed in the prosecution of the silver trade in both easterly and westerly directions were now "ships of Tarshish".

Suddenly we find gold and silver in such abundance in Jerusalem that Solomon “made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones… for abundance”. (1 Kings 10:27)

And how? “... for the king had at sea a navy of Tarshish with the navy of Hiram: once in three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks.” (v.22 See also Ezekiel 27:12, which mentions tin)

There can be no question that the peacocks came from South-East Asia. But whence the abundance of silver?

Says the historian Heeren:

> Silver is also found in Siberia and in China or South Asia, but the large annual importation of the metal from Europe in consequence of the high price it bore in the East sufficiently prove that it was found there in small quantities. We may therefore conclude with certainty that the greater portion of the silver possessed of old by the Asiatic nations was imported, and there can be no question that the Phoenicians were the channel of importation. (Heeren, *Historical Research*. Quoted by Johnston, pp.127,128)
ULTIMATE DESTINATION: OPHIR

The ultimate destination of the ships of Hiram and Solomon was a place or region called Ophir.

“And they came to Ophir,” says the Scripture, “and fetched from thence gold.” “And the navy also of Hiram, that brought gold from Ophir, brought in from Ophir great plenty of almug trees, and precious stones.” (1 Kings 9:28; 10:11)

From the books of Genesis (Genesis 10:29,30) and Josephus (Josephus, Flavius Antiquities of the Jews vi.4), it can be found that Ophir was the general name for the rich southern countries lying on the African, Arabian and Indian coasts.

But when we ask, Where was that Ophir which could be reached from Ezion-geber that provided silver in such abundance, we are faced with a problem.

It can be shown that the source was not Asia, the greater portion of whose silver was imported.

Silver was so scarce in Arabia, that it was assessed at ten times the value of gold. (Johnston, p.131)

Yet in Solomon’s Jerusalem it became as common as stones.

I am aware of the nineteenth century explorers’ tales that supposedly identified the mines of Ophir with central Africa. There are people who refuse to accept that the massive stone fortress known as the ruins of Zimbabwe (and situated in that country) could have been built by native Africans.

Such identification with King Solomon must be regarded as romantic fiction.

Zimbabwe is AD not BC and almost certainly it is the work of a powerful indigenous African empire.
“THREE YEAR” VOYAGES

That the expeditions pushed into regions much more distant than the Indian Ocean is apparent from the "three years" required for the double voyage, only nine months being required for a return journey to the extremities of Arabia. (Ibid., p.130)

Thomas Johnston suggests that Ophir “must be looked for in the farther East, and in a territory that was not only capable of supplying silver in practically unlimited quantities, but of affording conclusive evidence of occupancy by the Jews and Phoenicians.” (Ibid., p.132)

Johnston argues persuasively that the route of the expeditions can be traced beyond the peacock lands, through Indonesia, the Torres Strait (at the north of Australia), and via Samoa and Tahiti to Mexico and Peru. It appears that they founded colonies along the route.

An American destination accords well with the fact that the world’s largest silver deposits are in the Americas — in the United States, Mexico, Canada and Peru.

REACHED FROM TWO DIRECTIONS

The Bible says that the distant land of Tarshish was rich in silver, iron, tin and lead. (Ezekiel 27:12) It could be reached from the Mediterranean port of Joppa, also known as Jaffa (Jonah 1:3), or the Red Sea port of Ezion-geber (2 Chronicles 20:36).

A glance at the map tells us that the only part of the world that one would reach by ship from either the Mediterranean or Red Sea ports is the Atlantic seaboard.

Cyrus Gordon of Brandeis University, Massachusetts, says that a text mentioning "gold of Ophir" found at Tell Qasile on the Mediterranean coast of Israel, suggests that Ophir could be
reached via Gibraltar. I am aware that many places have been suggested as the location of Solomon’s fabled mines. New respect for the seagoing capabilities of early navigators makes the Americas a strong possibility.

“OFIR”

The Ugha Mongulala tribe of north-west Brazil preserve written records of an ancient city called Ofir (Ophir) which once stood at the mouth of the Amazon River.

This is the ONLY independent mention of a specific locality called Ophir, outside of the Bible. Could this be significant?

Their tradition states that:

Lhasa, the prince of Akakor... commanded the construction of Ofir, a powerful harbor city at the mouth of the Great River [the Amazon]. Ships from Samon’s [Solomon’s?] empire docked there with their valuable cargoes. In exchange for gold and silver…(Karl Brugger, The Chronicle of Akakor. New York: Delacorte Press, 1977, p.58)

Perhaps, like that of Tarshish, the name Ophir became displaced, and as the trade of the Phoenicians moved further eastward and westward, it moved with the trade, until in course of time it came to be applied to a more distant region controlled by the Phoenicians.

Corroborating this, the Phoenician Ophir or Ofor means, in their ancient language, the Western Country. (Fontaine How the World Was Peopled. Cited by Bancroft, Works of Bancroft: Vol v, p.65)

And what land lay to the west? The Americas, no less.
MIXED CREWS

While the expeditions were under Jewish and Phoenician direction, they undoubtedly carried crews and marine force of composite nationality. In the next chapter we shall touch on evidence suggesting that considerable numbers of Scythians and Thracians were employed on the Phoenician fleets. At this time in history Hebrew, Phoenician, Scythian and Thracian were the dominant factors in the national life of the eastern Mediterranean. The Thracians and Scythians were then the two great nations of south-eastern Europe. (Johnston, p.248)

EASTWARD

There must have been, from Ezion-geber, a general push of the giant "ships of Tarshish" toward the east.

To control the South Arabian markets could not have been the sole purpose of Solomon building his great ships. If these ships had been merely constructed to trade with Yemen, and back, and if, as the Scripture says, the journey had taken three years, then Solomon and Hiram were inept investors. The cost of the ships, the expense of working them, the interest on capital for such a long interval, as well as the deterioration of cargo in such a climate, would have outweighed any advantage of using sea transport, as against an overland route.

Furthermore, it seems most unlikely that expeditions to a place as close as Yemen could have wakened such enthusiasm, as to have brought Solomon and his court from their safe capital into the heart of a discontented country to witness the departure of the ships and their crews, as 2 Chronicles 8:17 records.

If we continue the line to Java and Sumatra, we will have reached the native home of the peacock, which was collected on the return journey of Solomon’s and Hiram’s expeditions.
Penetrating beyond Indonesia, we shall discover some facts of a rather startling nature.

The "ships of Tarshish" encountered unknown perils as they ventured into new regions. One particularly dangerous passage was along the north-western coast of Australia.

Any mariner approaching the north-west coast of Australia could find the West Kimberley area near Derby one of the most dangerous on the coast. A violent rip runs up to ten knots and creates whirlpools. To come in at the entrance to King Sound, ships must run through this riptide. There are many reefs and shoals. Navigation is hazardous.

Around the entrance to King Sound lie the islands of the Buccaneer Archipelago. King Sound itself is about 90 miles long and at its widest about 35 miles across.

A feature of this area is the extreme rise and fall of tides: up to 35 feet, which leaves ships high and dry.

Here salvage diver Allan Robinson found what he believed to be the wreck of an ancient Phoenician ship.

He noticed that in the mud of the swamp off the mainland, there was a strange shape. Small pips of mud seemed to project above the surroundings to form a shape more like a banana than a ship.

The contour was quite plain. A bronze plate was retrieved and declared by a university official to be of Phoenician origin.

The Phoenician wreck was near an overgrown mine of galena. And galena is an ore of silver, lead and zinc.

It is not surprising that, if the ships of Solomon and Hiram came as far as Java and Sumatra (which, as we said, was the native home of the peacock — one item of Solomon’s cargo), that they would have found the nearby coast of Australia.
Their route would have taken them through Torres Strait. And, conceivably, they could have sailed down the eastern coast of Australia.

Should it surprise us, then, that Phoenician-style engravings have been found on a marble slab in North Queensland? Or that further south along the coast, in New South Wales, many strange symbols, ships, and figures of Egyptian, Phoenician and Syrian style have been discovered carved on rocks along the Hawkesbury River?

Ancient Aboriginal legends tell how people in large ships like birds (the bird-headed prows of the old Phoenician triremes?) sailed into Gympie (now 34 miles inland), dug holes in the hills, erected the "sacred mountain" found nearby and interbred with local inhabitants. Interestingly, evidence of ancient mining and smelting was recently found here, as well as traces of a causeway or stone quay.

Near Toowoomba in Queensland, recently, a group of seventeen granite stones was discovered, bearing ancient inscriptions. These were identified as Phoenician. One of them has been translated to read "guard the shrine of Yahweh’s message". Another says, "God of gods".

Some years ago, a farmer in the Rockhampton area plowed up a large ironstone slab. Today the slab sits in the museum of Rex Gilroy near Tamworth, New South Wales. It bears another Phoenician inscription that reads, "Ships sail from this land under the protection of Yahweh to Dan."

Dan was an ancient trade centre in north-west Israel just south of Tyre, a Phoenician port. These discoveries were reported in an issue of the Ravenshoe Northern Star dated July-August-September, 1996.

As I commented in the book, Dead Men’s Secrets, fiction couldn’t challenge your imagination more. And yet here it all is,
fact after fact, story after story, about the lives and discoveries of a people thousands of years ago.

Now naturally these exhibits will not be popular with some people. The majority of the scientific community has greeted them with deathly silence because of early indoctrination in the theory of evolution. It tries to ignore them for the sole reason that it cannot explain them.

I ask, was it simply to control the nearby Arabian trade that Solomon and Hiram created the costly fleet of large armed ships of Tarshish? Or were these large, sophisticated vessels fitted out to travel the earth’s surface?

The biblical account suggests the latter. And the implications are dynamite.

INTO THE PACIFIC

As an eastern port on the Red Sea became a reality, the Phoenicians, with Solomon of Israel, now pursued with eagerness a further expansion eastward, to parallel that in the west.

And beyond Australia, they left a trail right across the Pacific. Samoa rises up dramatically from the sea. But its native population has traditionally not pronounced it as Samoa, but as Samo. And this was also the name of a Phoenician colony (pronounced the same way) on the coasts of Asia Minor — Samos. (Pliny, v.37)

The name Samo means, according to Pliny, "a mountain height by the sea". Both locations have a similar appearance, rising up from the sea. In fact, modern navigators term the Pacific Samoa "high islands", in contrast to the low coral atolls that surround it for hundreds of miles in all directions.
The principal island of Samoa is named *Upola* - the equivalent of the Scythian deity *Apollo*. And the main town of Western Samoa is *Apia* - which is the name of the Scythian deity, the Earth, (Herodotus, iv.59) as well as the name of the Peloponnesus (Strabo, 1.49337. Johnston, p.151) - a Phoenician locality.

Next, travelling east, the ships of Solomon and Hiram would have reached the Society Islands. Here is *Tahiti, with a silent "h"*. This is identical to *Tabiti* (probably also with a silent "b"). *Tabiti* was the Scythian Vista. Both names would be pronounced *Ta-iti*.

The name of Tahiti’s chief settlement, Papeete, is only a slightly modified form of the name of the Scythian Jupiter, or father, *Papeus*.

*Morea*, the name of an island separated from Papeete by a narrow strait, is the same as *Morea*, a principal district of the Hellenic Peninsula in the Mediterranean, colonized by the Scythians shortly before the period of Solomon’s expeditions. *Morea* was given that name because the contour of the shoreline resembled a mulberry leaf. This explanation is also applicable to *Morea* of the Pacific.

It would seem that in the Pacific the Phoenicians followed the same policy as in the Mediterranean. They established stations for the ships to call at on these long voyages. It appears that these colonies were placed under the care of responsible governors, drawn from the Scythians of the marine corps, since most of the names we have referred to were clearly drawn from this source.

There is no other explanation for the presence of Scythians in the heart of the Pacific.

Enormous stone remains in many of the Pacific Islands can be linked with local traditions.
Strong’s Island is one example. An ancient tradition says that "an ancient city once stood round this harbor which was occupied by a powerful people called Anut, who had large vessels in which they made long voyages, many moons being required in their prosecution. (Johnston, Ibid).

Early European missionaries to the Pacific found in these islands evidence of numeric skill, cosmogony, astronomical knowledge and religious system which was plainly Phoenician.

For example, the Phoenician skill in the use of numbers and astronomy is reflected in the same extraordinary skill of the Society Islanders. And their names of stars and constellations and the use to which they applied their knowledge of the heavenly bodies was the same as that of the Phoenicians.

Their sacred groves, open-air temples or marais, their human sacrifices, and their methods of initiation and practice, were identical to those of the priests of Astarte on the eastern Mediterranean.

It should be noted that, throughout the period of the Solomon-Hiram voyages, both Israel and Phoenicia were monotheistic, worshipping the one true Creator. But later, both nations descended into the worship of Baal the sun-god and Astarte (Ashtarto) the "queen of heaven". The expeditions were, however, continuing during this period. Thus, although monotheism had been planted first throughout the world wherever the expeditions went, this was eventually corrupted as new generations of sailors brought their practices with them.

The Phoenician alphabet of 16 letters was the same as the Samoan. The natives of Samos (Samo) in the Mediterranean were famous as seamen; likewise the Pacific Samoans were famed for their nautical skill.

The gymnastic systems used in the Mediterranean, as a means of training for war, as well as the implements used (including spear, javelin, bow and arrow, dart, sword, falchion, and sling
and boomerang) are found over the entire route of the ships across the Pacific to the Americas.

The historical traditions, practices, circumcision and some other customs such as test of virginity were clearly Jewish.

Further customs (tattooing, spear and javelin throwing) were clearly Thracian.

Their worship of the skulls of ancestors, cannibalism, and use of bow and arrow as a test of strength were peculiarly Scythian.

Research has established that the implements of war and the festivals and games among these Polynesians were the same as those found in the ancient Mediterranean. And the foregoing is just a small sampling of the many parallels.

Here are startling facts, pointing to the presence together of four races — Hebrew, Phoenician, Scythian and Thracian — in the mid-Pacific in the remote past.

How can this be explained, if not through the instrumentality of the historic expeditions of Hiram and Solomon?

The *Encyclopaedia Brittanica* notes concerning the Polynesians that, while their facial features sometimes suggest Mongoloid affinities, their light skin, wavy hair and full beards, as well as their blood types, suggest European ties. (*Encyclopaedia Brittanica*, 1985, art. "Polynesians")

This is certainly consistent with the planting of outposts in the Pacific by European members of Solomon’s and Hiram’s crews, such as Scythians and Thracians.

**AND ON TO THE AMERICAS**

The Maya population already inhabited central portions of the American continent.
Votan, the first historian of the Maya (c.1000 BC), actually reported the arrival around that time, on the Pacific coasts of Central America, of seven large ships.

Fray Lizana set down in his *Historia de Yucatan* the tradition that from the west (that is, from the direction of the Pacific) "many" people had come. (Johnston, p.69)

APPENDIX 4

COULD ANYTHING BE SPOKEN INTO EXISTENCE?

DID THE EARTH’S ROCKS TAKE MILLIONS OF YEARS TO COOL?

One spring day in 1965, a young American scientist was peering through his microscope at some thin, translucent sections of granite type rocks.

Suddenly it struck him. Here was something that – dare he even think it? – had the potential to turn an established theory upside down!

And, as it turned out, that was precisely what happened. His discoveries raised an uproar in the scientific world! And he lost funding.

Is this new to you?:

* Did you know that PHYSICAL scientific evidence definitely supports the Genesis account of Creation?
* Were you aware that reports outlining this evidence passed peer review, and were published in the open scientific literature?

* Have you heard that, decades later, this evidence still stands unrefuted by the scientific community?

Now comes the big question:

**Genesis: scientific validation**

**QUESTION:** Is there any scientific “proof” validating the book of Genesis? (The definition of "scientific" means that the evidence can be reproduced under laboratory conditions.)

**ANSWER:** Yes, here is evidence that can be tested under laboratory conditions. It is the kind of evidence which will qualify as “scientific” in the sense that it can be repeated. It invites close scrutiny.

**An amazing secret in granite rocks**

The evidence is embedded in the granite rocks of our planet.

What are granite rocks? They are coarsely crystalline rocks composed primarily of the light-coloured minerals quartz and feldspar, and smaller amounts of biotite and hornblende. We should be careful when referring to granites because geologists often use this term to cover a variety of rocks, some of which are not at all similar to the “Precambrian” granite of which we are speaking.

These granite rocks are the original Genesis rocks, because:
* they are the foundation rocks of the continents
* they contain no fossils (as do sedimentary rocks)
* they contain polonium halos.
And that’s where the story gets interesting.

**How long did it take to form the solid rock?**

Suppose you drop an Alka-Seltzer into a glass of water, what happens? Lots of tiny bubbles are released. How long does each bubble last? Just an instant, right?

Did you know that in the granite rocks of the earth “bubbles” of **polonium** have been found? A speck of polonium in molten rock is like an Alka-Seltzer dropped into a glass of water. It has
a very short life. The beginning of effervescence may be equated to the instant the polonium atoms began to decay and emit radioactive particles.

If the rock remained molten very long (as evolutionary geology theory says) the traces of those radioactive particles of polonium would disappear as quickly as the Alka-Seltzer bubbles in water.

But suppose that after you dropped your Alka-Seltzer into the water, then the water was instantly frozen. What would happen to the bubbles? The bubbles would be preserved.

Likewise, polonium halos could be formed only if the "effervescing" specks of polonium had been instantly trapped in solid rock. That is, we could find polonium halos in rock, ONLY IF the molten rock had become suddenly solid.

Now, as we are told by the evolutionary theory, the earth’s foundation granite rocks formed as hot magma slowly cooled from liquid to solid over millions of years.
A rude shock

I was taught this at school. Very likely, you were, too. But now there comes an unsettling discovery. And you can blame it on world renowned nuclear physicist, Dr Robert Gentry. He has found something that has shaken the scientific world.

Dr Gentry was teaching and working toward a doctorate in physics at the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. He was using a microscope on some thin, translucent sections of granite-type rocks.

That spring day in 1965, as he looked closely, he noticed that there were beautiful microspheres of colouration etched within
the rocks - halos. These tiny halos were series of concentric rings around a radioactive centre.

A halo is created when a grain of radioactive material in the centre decays. As it decays, it throws off alpha particles.

A polonium halo could be produced from two sources:
   (a) from the radioactive decay of uranium as a parent element, or
   (b) from the decay of original polonium (that is, with no uranium involved)

What Robert Gentry was looking at in these rocks were special types of halos. They had been produced by the radioactive decay of original polonium, which is known to have only a fleeting existence.

More exhaustive experimentation failed to reveal a secondary origin of these halos. This confirmed that the polonium that produced these halos was an original, natural element. It was present since the beginning.

This Polonium-218 is so short lived, its half-life is a mere 3 minutes.

This means that at the beginning of the world it had to appear in the granite while the granite was in a liquid state. Then it had to be “frozen” into solidified granite within a matter of minutes in order to produce a halo – before it totally disappeared.

And now it turns out that an exceedingly large number of polonium halos are embedded in granite rock all around the world.

Just as frozen Alka-Seltzer bubbles would be clear evidence of the quick-freezing of the water, so are these many polonium
halos undeniable evidence that a sea of original matter quickly "froze" into solid granite.

Please understand that this is a physical fact that can be tested.

Evidence of instant creation?

As a result of Dr Gentry’s experiments the question now arose, could it be that the basement rocks of the earth were actually created within the few minutes it takes for polonium to decay? Could the polonium halos actually be evidence of an instantaneous creation?

You see, if the earth’s crust was created suddenly, then the rock would immediately be solid enough to hold the tracks produced by decaying polonium.

Dr Gentry submitted to the scientific establishment that these halos, then, provided unambiguous evidence of both an almost instantaneous creation of granites, and the young age of the earth.

To put this another way, the existence of these polonium halos distinctly implied that our earth was formed in a very short time, and which we discover Genesis has been telling us all along:

* “And God said, Let there be... and there was.” (Gen.1:3)
* “And God said, Let there be... and it was so.” (vv.6-8)
* “And God said, Let the.......... and it was so.” (v.9)
* “And God said, Let the......... and it was so.” (v.11)
* “And God said, Let there be... and it was so.” (vv.14,15)
* “And God said, Let the......... and it was so.” (v.24)

These halos from original polonium invalidated the assumption of uniform decay over endless time. This pulled the rug from under the radiometrically derived 4.5 billion-year age of the earth.
It could now be asked: Were these the rocks that the Mighty One created when He spoke this planet into existence? Were these “instant” halos the Creator’s fingerprints in earth’s original rocks?

**Challenge to the National Academy of Sciences**

Over 20 years, Dr Gentry tried to wake up the scientific diehards concerning the implications of this discovery. He published unrefuted scientific evidence for an instant creation in premier scientific journals, including *Nature, Science, Applied Physics Letters*, and others. The evolutionist controlled National Academy of Sciences vehemently opposed the horrifying idea of creation, even claiming that the evidence for creation had been scientifically invalidated.

Dr Gentry repeatedly challenged the Academy to “publicly explain where the polonium-halo evidence for creation has ever been scientifically invalidated.”

It was embarrassing. They were unable to prove their claim. On his website [http://www.halos.com](http://www.halos.com) Dr Gentry has since posted letters and other documents pertaining to his challenge to the National Academy of Science.

Every question regarding the validity or implications of the polonium-halo evidence for creation was systematically dealt with in his published reports. The result was that every proposal for an evolutionary origin of polonium radio-halos has been systematically and experimentally falsified. And since then, no hypothetical, naturalistic scenario has yet been suggested that can account for the mystery of the polonium halo.

Of course, you can find claims to the contrary on the Internet and elsewhere. But if these claims had any real substance, they would have passed peer review and been published in the open
scientific literature. The fact that they have not been, or have themselves been experimentally falsified, demonstrates the fact that this unique evidence for Creation still stands unrefuted. The trillions of tiny polonium halos embedded in basement rocks all over this planet, together form a Gibraltar of evidence that Creation does, after all, have a scientific basis. At the same time it calls into question the entire radiometric dating system.

**Original polonium, or from a later slow decay of uranium?**

Radioactive atoms can spontaneously change, or decay, to atoms of a different type. Uranium can change into lead, or for that matter, into polonium, over a period of time. So the following question has been raised:

**QUESTION:** How do you know that these polonium halos in granite rock are primordial (original) polonium – and were not produced from the later slow decay of uranium?

**ANSWER:** Why does this question arise? Because if the polonium halos in the granites were primordial (existing from the beginning), it logically follows that the granites must also be primordial - they must be earth’s original Genesis rocks. And they solidified almost instantly – fast enough to preserve the short-lived polonium bubbles. But evolution theory cannot allow that possibility.

Well, can we know for sure? Indeed, we can.

It is true that **secondary polonium halos**, derived from the decay of uranium, have been discovered (for example, in coalified wood). However, these are found to be **intrinsically different** from the polonium halos in granite. (For a thorough presentation of such evidence, see Robert Gentry’s book, *Creation’s Tiny Mystery.*)
There is now much published evidence showing that polonium halos in granite have originated independently of uranium. More exhaustive experimentation has failed to reveal any secondary origin of the halos in granite. This means that these halos have to be original, Genesis halos in original, primary Genesis granite rocks.

In brief, the laboratory of nature has provided:

1. positive, unambiguous evidence for a primordial origin of polonium halos in granites, as well as
2. decisive, independent evidence against their secondary origin.

The challenge

If evolutionary theory were correct, it should be possible to reproduce both granite and polonium halos in granite, since this process is supposed to have happened countless times over millions of years.

But, on the other hand, if the granites and the enclosed polonium halos are the Creator’s handwriting, then it is impossible for man to reproduce them.

And what is the reality? It is a fact that no one has produced granite, much less granite with polonium halos.

Their collective failure to do this – coupled with the fact that granite melted in the earth cools to form rhyolite, not granite – signifies that the Creator left unambiguous evidence of His creative power when He called the earth into existence suddenly.

Until the discovery of polonium halos, anyone ignorant of the Creator’s astonishing power might be excused for thinking instantaneous creation to be a myth. But not now.
The Supreme Creator’s power does not need millions of years

An ancient record states that “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made: and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth...For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.” (Psa.33:6,9)

This was an instantaneous event. Just as a nuclear explosion instantly turns matter into energy, so at Creation God spoke, turning energy into matter. As you probably know, matter is energy vibrating at a different speed. Physical matter that we see today is the result of sound resonating energy into form.

No matter what half-informed people may say, the book of Genesis has turned out to be very scientific.

It tells us: “And God said, Let there be... and there was.”

The time issue is very important. Only an infinitely powerful, supremely intelligent God can create in a very short time. The more power and intelligence operating in creation, the less time was necessary.

He did not need to sit back for billions of years and let death and accident, suffering, brutality and randomness do His creative work.

He did not need to produce mankind from part-animals, brutally clubbing each other in a bleeding, dying world that took aeons to emerge painfully from some primordial slime.

Created by words

Genesis informs us that God created by His words. He “spoke and it was done.” We now know from scientific discovery that every living thing is created and recreated by a language called
the DNA code.

The Creator has recorded His message upon a tape in your body cells. This DNA tape consists of two ribbons of instructions which twist around each other in helical fashion like a spiral staircase. (See Jonathan Gray, The Weapon the Globalists Fear, pages 48 to 50.)

When God said, **“Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind,”** God put his instructions in the form of DNA codes into all plant cells.

If you speak into a microphone, your thoughts and instructions can be recorded on a cassette tape. You can play it back time and again.

This sparks meaning into the phrase **“God said”**. What God said is recorded on nucleic acid tapes, becoming the DNA code of the cell of each plant, animal and human. Yes, it contains the instructions to create every part of every organ of your very own body. As King David recognised 3,000 years ago: **“In your book all my parts were written, every one of them.”**

God’s book is now called **“Book of Man”** (human genome).

There are instructions in your cells on how to manufacture and reproduce every different part of your body. The words are set out in sentences, and paragraphs and chapters.

The genes are like sentences. Several genes together make a paragraph. Many paragraphs of gene clusters make a chapter. Many chapters make a book, which we call a chromosome. There are 23 chromosome books to make the whole encyclopedia of instructions. An encyclopedia comprises a complete person. This is duplicated to make an identical copy, so that your body has two encyclopedias – that is, 46 books (chromosomes) in each human cell.
These books contain so many words that the human encyclopedia is more than ten times as long as *Encyclopedia Brittanica*. To put this another way, *over a million pages* are needed for all human instructions.

And this DNA message is played back every time a new life is created, because its instructions are obeyed to the last letter.

This one million page DNA message book gives complicated technical instructions to make a plant or an animal or a man. They are more technical than any man-made computerised code for making a passenger airliner, for example. They are more technical than any of the computers on our planet.

Think about this. Could a series of faults in instructions (mutations) make, by accident, such a technical code?

This code, like a Morse code of dots and dashes, needs to be translated before it can be used. The truth is, this DNA code needed someone who knew the translation and then made a machine to translate it. That translation machine is included into every cell of your body, as well.

Think about this. Someone was needed to (a) know the code secret and (b) make the code breaker.

Very complicated machinery is needed by your body, like the non-stop blood-pump (your heart) and the circulatory system of pipes to and from every organ.

To produce these requires technically complex and compatible interlocking machinery to read off instructions and to manufacture correctly.

Think about this. Who provided the blueprint for correct positioning?
Also, there are over 15,000 different machines in the simplest cell of your body – as well as thousands of machine tools and thousands of workers (enzymes) at the assembly lines.

Each worker has his own special key to start up his machine. No one else has a copy of that particular key. They work at furious speed, handling thousands of molecules a minute and following instructions.

Proteins are also workers inside the cell. Each little protein molecule does the most fabulous things. It carries out complicated tasks which require great intelligence. The problem is there is not a nerve cell anywhere in its body. No brains.

Armies of proteins carry out complicated series of actions. Every step is complex, yet the finished result is always perfect.

**All need to exist together, instantly!**

These workers are all made, separately inside each cell, but here is the catch: the cell cannot make them until they are made, because they are part of the cell. In other words, they cannot be made without the cell doing it. But the cell cannot exist unless they are already there to form the cell.

DNA only works because it has enzymes to help it; enzymes only work because there are protein chains; protein only works because of DNA; DNA only works because it is formed of protein chains. They all have to be there together, immediately, at the same time.

But the enzymes only work because the protein chains are coded in a special sequence by DNA. DNA can only replicate with the help of protein enzymes. We are really in a chicken and egg situation.”  (E. Ambrose, *The Nature and Origin of the Biological World*, p. 135)
Here’s a puzzle for you. DNA cannot form without pre-existing protein. But proteins cannot form without pre-existing DNA!

So, please answer me: From where and how did the first protein originate, to facilitate the DNA code structure in each species?

Mathematical probability alone has shown that even if our earth and our universe were billions times trillions of years old, it would not even begin to scratch the odds of the simplest protein molecule forming by chance, much less an entire cell.

This requires intelligent, outside input.

Yes, genetics is God’s speech in creation.

Outmoded theory

You and I need to stop believing the errors of those armchair experts who peddle evolution. They are stuck with an outmoded mid-19th century theory that was devised when almost nothing was known about proteins, genetics, or microbiology. And they are ashamed to admit that modern research has shown their theory to be a hoax. Although they choose to defend an error, you do not have to be part of it.

Voice pictures

Let’s consider this from another angle.

We noted the statement that “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made: and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth…For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.” (Psalm 33:6,9) Here’s another: “…the worlds were framed by the word of God.” (Hebrews 11:3)
Does this mean that He could stand back and say, “Come on light… you exist”, and it would exist – just like that?

That’s exactly it. We can’t do it, but, according to the Scripture, the supreme Creator can. Often through the Genesis creation account (as recorded in Genesis 1), we find, “God said… and it was so.” As He named a thing, it immediately existed. As He called it, it appeared. As He spoke, it came into existence.

I have in my possession some amazing pictures. They were photographed by a Mrs Watts-Hughes, a voice teacher.

This lady decided one day to experiment. She would try to record in some way the intensity of her voice as she sang. So she placed an elastic membrane over the large opening of some sort of receiver. Then she ran a large tube to her mouth.

On the elastic membrane she placed some sand, or powder, slightly moistened. As she sang, the vibrations of her voice were transmitted to the membrane.

In each instance, the agitation of the sand produced the shape of some flower, or plant, or tree, or some form of simple animal life. *(The Century Magazine, in the US Library of Congress)*

Among the forms she photographed was a daisy. She sang into the tube, and around a raised centre, petals sprang out. There were from six to thirty, or even more, of these petals on a bloom. Sometimes they would appear singly, and at other times there would be two, three, or even four layers of petals, partially overlapping each other, showing the same difference we see between the double and treble garden flowers and wild flowers we see in nature.

Just think about this. If a human being can sing into a tube, causing sand, or powder, to agitate and form shapes of plants, trees, and so on, then what about our Maker? If a man’s breath can produce the forms, or shapes, of plant life, don’t you think
that the Supreme Creator could, by the breath of His mouth, do exactly what Genesis says He did?

When the Creator spoke, whatever He named immediately existed – not merely in shape, but in living form.

Again, the Scripture says, “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.” (Heb.11:3)

It doesn’t really sound so absurd any more, does it?

Speaking further of her experiments, Mrs Watts-Hughes wrote:

I regret particularly that I have not found it possible to preserve perfectly the most delicate of these floral forms, as they in part collapse when the moist paste dries.
Further, I may mention that I have also obtained another description of voice-flowers, distinct from the above mentioned daisy class both in form and in the manner of its production, which may be called a pansy class, with varieties more like the violet, primrose, or geranium.
To obtain these pansy forms, about the same quantity of color-paste as for daisy forms must be placed upon the disk, but with considerably more water, sufficient water being required to allow the paste to move freely on it when disturbed by the vibrations of the elastic disk, the petals seeming to shoot out from the centers of motion and then to spread themselves in the water. This class of lower forms usually has its petals in threes, whether one, two, or more sets.

In leaving the floral forms, I may mention that great care and delicacy in singing are demanded for their production,
which will afford ample training for any vocalist in regard to the steady sustaining of notes in intensities from the softest pianissimo to a very loud forte, as every grade of intensity is required in its turn in order to evoke these forms in their various sizes, ranging from that of a pinhead to that of a large-sized daisy.

A voice experiment for you

**APPARATUS:**
- Several bowls or containers
- Plastic cling wrap
- Sand or fine “sediment” type material, such as polenta or talc
- Water in a spray canister
- A long tube
- A good singing voice

**ACTION:**
- Stretch the cling wrap over the bowls or containers to make a taut covering.
- Lightly dampen the cling wrap.
- Sprinkle sand, polenta, or talc over the cling wrap.
- Place one end of the tube on the cling wrap.
- Place the mouth of the singer over the other end of the tube.
- Sing.

**OBSERVATION:**
As the voice causes the cling wrap to vibrate, the sand begins to move into groups in various different shapes, creating pictures. The longer the singing continues, the sharper the pictures become. (In experiments, whole landscapes have been created, also animals.)
CONCLUSION:
With the right formula, the superior knowledge of the Creator, and His wondrous voice, the world was created.

* * * * * * *

This Appendix has been taken from Jonathan Gray’s book *The Weapon the Globalists Fear*, chapter 2.
APPENDIX 5

DATING THE FIRST MAN AND WOMAN

The following study on genetic mutations of the mitochondrial DNA is not presented as proof of the age of mankind, but rather to illustrate that when scientific research replaces theoretical data with actually observed data, the results align ever closer to the biblical data.

But something that we shall all need to address head-on is this. It may now be stated categorically that not one confirmed scientific discovery has ever controverted a biblical reference.

This may be new to you, but scientific research has established the accuracy of the biblical data in all instances in which it can be tested. And this amounts to many hundreds of cases. Such a perfect track record is unknown for any other document on earth. (See my book The Weapon the Globalists Fear for examples of such evidence.)

It is not surprising that Donald J. Wiseman, Professor Emeritus of Assyriology, University of London, felt a need to testify:

   It has been my long experience that when the Bible is rightly understood and interpreted it is never contradicted by archaeological and historical evidence when that too has been subjected to strict scrutiny.” (Forward to Victor Pearce’s book Evidence For Truth: Archaeology, 2nd edition, 1998)

You almost feel sorry for the critic. Nowadays, it seems that in every attack on the Bible, the critic ends up losing. The poor guy is a sucker for punishment, if you ask me.
MITOCHONDRIAL RESEARCH

What fascinates me is that when mainstream science applies its own criteria to actually observed data, it finds itself more or less agreeing with the biblical record. Mitochondrial research is no exception.

But first, I’d like you to notice something in the biblical book of Genesis. It says that all mankind is descended from the same original woman:

And Adam called his wife’s name Eve; because she was the mother of all living. (Gen.3:20)

For some time, scientists have been using the DNA found in small organelles in our cells called mitochondria. Through studying mitochondrial DNA it is possible to trace one’s ancestry. Mitochondrial DNA is passed on to us by our mothers alone.

Recent studies of mitochondrial DNA led to a very important discovery. The evidence indicated that all human beings alive on earth today are descended from the same original woman. This woman they call the “mitochondrial Eve”.

Trained in molecular biology, they [the scientists] looked at an international assortment of genes and picked up a trail of DNA that led them to a single woman from whom we are all descended.  (John Tierney, Lynda Wright, and Karen Springen, “The Search for Adam and Eve,” Newsweek, January 11, 1988, p.46)

While the location of this first woman is debated, some saying Africa, others claiming Asia or the Middle East, the fact of one original woman apparently is not. (Ann Gibbons, “Mitochondrial Eve: Wounded, But Not Dead Yet”, Science, August 14, 1992, pp. 873-875)

The point is that all human beings on earth are descended from the same original mother.
The reason for the use of mitochondrial DNA in this search, rather than the DNA in the nucleus of our cells, is that mitochondrial DNA is passed on to us, by our mothers alone. In this it is unique.

**DATING THE FIRST WOMAN**

The next question was, how long ago did this first woman live?

In order to find the approximate date of the original mother, scientists examined the rate of mutations (that is, alterations) in the Mitochondrial Organels.

They looked at the most distant branches of the family tree – the DNA types most different from one another – and worked backward to figure out how many steps it would have taken for Eve’s original DNA to mutate into these different types. They assumed that these mutations occurred at a regular rate – a controversial assumption that might be wrong. (Tierney, Wright, and Springen, p. 50)

Using this complicated technique it was postulated that the first mother of the human race appeared on earth 100,000 to 200,000 years ago.

Even by using their very slow-gradual-change idea of evolutionism, the result yielded a date for the first woman that was uncomfortably less than the million or more years of evolutionary belief.

More recent research, however, changed the mutation rate dating. For the first time, *actually observed data* was used. The result was troubling for the evolutionists. It showed that the rate of mutation is far more rapid than previously calculated.

In an article published in *Science* magazine of January 2, 1998, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, researchers announced:
Mitochondrial DNA appears to mutate much faster than expected, prompting new DNA forensics procedures and raising troublesome questions about the dating of evolutionary events. In 1991, Russians exhumed a Siberian grave containing nine skeletons thought to be the remains of the last Russian tsar, Nicholas II, and his family and retinue, who were shot by firing squad in 1918. But two bodies were missing, so no one could be absolutely certain of the identity of the remains. And DNA testing done in 1992 – expected to settle the issue quickly – instead raised a new mystery. (Ann Gibbons, “Calibrating the Mitochondrial Clock”, *Science*, January 2, 1998, p. 28)

The mystery concerned dates relating to the clock rate. It appears that mutations occur at a much faster rate than assumed. Independent investigations have verified the faster rate.

Based upon evidence first presented at the First International Workshop on Human Mitochondrial DNA held in Washington DC during October 25-28, 1997, the prestigious weekly *Science* magazine of January 2, 1998, stated that:

> Regardless of the cause, evolutionists are most concerned about the effect of a faster mutation rate. For example, researchers have calculated that ‘mitochondrial Eve’ – the woman whose mtDNA was ancestral to that in all living people – lived 100,000 to 200,000 years ago in Africa. Using the new clock [based on the latest scientific evidence], she would be a mere 6000 years old. (*Ibid.*, p. 29)

What a shock! Only 6,000 years? But, checking and rechecking, that was the figure!

However, did you know this? The scientists who arrived at this mtDNA 6,000-years-ago dating for our first common mother, were *not really the first* to do so.

If you didn’t know, that very same claim was already written down in ancient documents. Indeed, the scientists’ mtDNA 6,000-years-ago dating for the first woman turned out to be *the*
same as the dating given in Genesis and its related books of the Bible!

Naturally, such dating could never be accepted by dyed-in-the-wool evolutionists.

So, although not hiding the evidence, they have denied it…. as you see from the article, which goes on to say, “No one thinks that’s the case [that Eve is 6,000 years old], but at what point should models switch from one mtDNA time zone to the other?” (Ibid.)

“No one thinks that…?” Perhaps Ann Gibbons should have written, “No evolutionist thinks that’s the case.”

Instead of accepting the implications of their findings, evolutionary scientists are trying to get around this evidence.

So much for scientific objectivity!

THE DATE FOR THE FIRST WOMAN

This report is presented not to endorse mitochondrial research, but simply to illustrate that when science replaces theoretical data with actually observed data, the results align ever closer to the biblical data.

In this case, mainstream science, by applying its own criteria to physically observed data, arrives at a date of 6,000 years ago for the mother of all the human race.

The credibility at stake is not mine. One will need to argue with the scientists claiming the discovery. Since it touches on our topic, I’m just passing it on to you.

The fact that the evolution-biased participants disliked the outcome of their own study is noteworthy. It indicates that the
study was not rigged. It was a top calibre scientific research project, with a surprise ending.

The study can be falsified only by proving it was based on faulty criteria.

COMPARING THE WITNESSES

To recall some information we noted in Chapter 6 of this present work, the Toltecs believed that the Flood came “after the world had existed for 1,716 years.” (Francis Hitching, *World Atlas of Mysteries*. London: Pan Books, Ltd., 1978, p.165)

In the sixteenth century, the native Mexican chronicler, Ixtilxochitl in his *Relaciones* penned a history based on all available pre-Conquest records and legends, aided by his ability to understand the native tongue and decipher the hieroglyphics. The history began with the creation of the world by the supreme god Tloque Nahuaque. This first era lasted 1,716 years, until floods swept over the earth. This is only a 60 year variation from the figure given in the King James Bible. (Genesis chapter 5) Is it possible that the Genesis book is more scientific than we thought?

So, to recap:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The first woman</th>
<th>The Great Flood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toltecs say</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 1716 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis says</td>
<td>c. 4000 BC</td>
<td>&gt; 1656 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science says</td>
<td>c. 4000 BC</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mitochondrial DNA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interesting.
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