

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 36

THE DATING OF FOSSILS AND ROCKS

The "dating" of rocks, fossils, bones, and other non-living things, is an attempt to determine when that rock, fossil, etc. was created or when the animal lived.

While some of the types of "dating." such as the dating of rocks, do have significant merit, the dating of some rocks and some bones and other organic material is grossly inaccurate.

Why would scientists intentionally accept dates which are known to be inaccurate? Obviously to pretend that evolution is true.

Scientists frequently and conveniently forget to take into account key factors if the dating method gives them the numbers they want!! This justifies the theory of evolution.

One example of total fraud is the methods they use to date human bones. Evolutionists love to date bones, especially human bones, to be older than when Adam and Eve fell from the Garden of Eden (about 4,000 B.C. or about 6,000 years ago).

In fact, many of the claims of the evolutionists, such as their discoveries of transitional species (scientists depend on evolution taking many millions of years to create human DNA from the "first living cell"), totally depend on the dating techniques they use!!

Some of the dating techniques are reasonable (but that does not mean they are accurate), but most of their techniques are known to ignore key factors.

For example, evolutionists intentionally hide (from their students) the fact that moisture leeches radioactive materials from cells and thus completely destroys the accuracy of radiometric dating!!

THE KENNEWICK MAN

The Kennewick man is a good example of their deceptions. In this case the bones of a man were found in a "shallow grave" next to a major river (the Columbia River)!! You would expect that the bones got wet or at least were constantly moist from mist, humidity and rain!!

No matter when this man died, his body and bones would have been exposed to a massive amount of moisture!!

Radiometric dating claimed his bones were 9,000 years old (i.e. older than when Adam and Eve fell). That is the age they wanted!! Hurray for evolution!!!

The truth is that the bones were probably no more than 300 years old. A body sitting in a shallow grave, next to a major river, for 300 years, could easily be dated to be 9,000 years old because moisture would leech radioactive atoms from the cells.

Had these bones been found in an Arizona desert, instead of by the Colorado River, they might have been dated to be even older due to heat (even if the two sets of bones were the bones of twin brothers who died on the same day) which would make the bones look far older than they actually were.

Now let us talk about the flood of Noah.

The flood of Noah guaranteed that the bones of every human being on the planet earth (and animals), **who were alive before the flood** (except for those on the ark, two of which were resurrected two thousand year ago) soaked in water for a good long time (perhaps for many years in some parts of the world).

Because of the Noah's Ark account, any bones from before Noah's time could date to being millions of years old, depending on a number of factors. Would it surprise anyone that carbon dating and other dating techniques yield dates the evolutionists want and that these dates claim to challenge the Biblical account!!

How ironic - the story of Noah's explains why these bones would be dated to be so old, but yet the "age" of these bones is considered a proof that Noah's ark is a fairy tale.

But as long as the numbers give the evolutionists "evidence" for evolution, they accept the numbers as factual and present them in their classes, articles and books.

But this is not science, it is using bogus scientific data to support their atheism. Consider this brilliant quote:

"Arizona State University anthropologist Geoffrey Clark echoed this view in 1997 when he wrote that 'we select among alternative sets of research conclusions **in accordance with our biases and preconceptions** -- a process that is, at once, both political and subjective.' Clark suggested 'that paleoanthropology has the form but not the substance of a science.'"

Icons of Evolution - Science or Myth? Jonathan Wells, page 223

CAVES

Caves represent another opportunity for scientists to lie with numbers.

All of the common types of caves are formed by water. The water may have come from above (e.g. rainfall or a creek) or it may have come from below (i.e. an underground creek or hot springs), but all of the common types of caves were cut-out by water.

This means caves are very, very humid because there is almost always an existing source of water in the cave, such as a creek or dripping water, to name but two sources.

Thus, skeletons found in caves are, by definition, highly exposed to moisture.

Do scientists take the massive amount of moisture found in caves into account when they date a skeleton found in a cave? The answer is 'no'.

Is this because scientists are simply incompetent or is it because scientists intentionally want us to believe that all skeletons are very, very old?

Since caves are places where "cave men" have dwelled, it is critical for scientists to calculate very high dates for "cave men," meaning it is important to make their bones seem very, very old. The goal, as always, is to get the date prior to 6,000 B.C. or as close to that as possible.

In addition, most cave drawings were drawn using organic material, such as blood or sap from plants. Would the humidity in caves affect the dating of cave drawings? Absolutely!! Yet the dating of cave drawings never takes into account the high humidity in caves.

HEAT

Heat can cause even more inaccuracy in their dating techniques, as already mentioned.

For example, consider the Kaupulehu Flow, Hualalai Volcano; which is well known to have occurred in 1800-1801. The date of this explosion is very well documented.

Twelve different samples were taken of the lava. The dates for these samples ranged from **140 million years ago** to **2.96 billion years ago**. While the ocean water may have affected the dating of these samples; many things could affect

the dating of any sample! For example, volcanic rock is known to be hot both during and after the explosion.

Thus, a volcano which is known to have occurred a little over 200 years ago, could date to being as much as 3 billion years ago using state-of-the-art dating techniques.

As another example, five different samples were taken from Mt. St. Helens, in Washington state; which erupted multiple times between 1980 and 1986.

Five samples from these explosions dated from half a million years ago to almost 3 million years ago. No ocean water was involved in Mt. St. Helens, only heat was involved.

What does this tell us about fossils of supposed "near-humans" who were killed by a volcano, or whose skeleton sat in the sun for many centuries? It tells us the dating of fossils is a very inexact science. That is exactly the way the scientific establishment likes it because their current, flawed methods give them the dates they want.