

Making the case against scientific dating methods

Any heretic who suggests a revision of the chronologies of ancient history or archeology is pooh-pooed by establishment scientists. The establishment leans on scientific dating methods to reinforce their unassailable established chronology.

Three main scientific dating methods that we have room to deal with here are radiocarbon dating, thermoluminescence, and stratigraphy. All are flawed, and thus the accepted chronologies of ancient history and archeology can reasonably be said to be in doubt.

Radiocarbon (C-14) Dating

This dating method is supposed to give accurate dates for organic materials up to 50,000 years old. However, C-14 dating is wracked with anomalies.

Freshly slaughtered seals underwent C-14 dating and the results said that the seals were 1,300 years old. Living mollusks have been found by C-14 analysis to be 2,300 years old. And living trees have had C-14 dating insist that they have been dead for 10,000 years. The problem is contamination. Any source of airborne carbon dioxide, like a volcano or an airport, will falsify a radiocarbon date. Water will also falsify radiocarbon dates. There is no way to tell if a sample is contaminated, and no way to decontaminate samples.

In addition, when scientists submit an object to a lab for radiocarbon dating, they know what an acceptable answer is. If the lab indicates a date out of line with expectations, the data is thrown out. This is called "culling the data." Essentially, the chronology of history has been built on radiocarbon dates that have been selectively culled to fit preconceptions.

As the adage goes, "to a man with a hammer, everything looks like a nail." If there are problems with the conventionally accepted chronology of history, we would never learn of them, because the data would be thrown out.

In 1989, radiocarbon dating utterly failed a blind test performed by the British Science and Engineering Research Council, with a sample of known age submitted to 38 different laboratories. None of the labs found the correct date. Only seven labs, or 18.5 percent, returned results within so-called "acceptable limits." The remaining 81.5 percent of the labs were completely wrong, many off by thousands of years. In other words, radiocarbon dating, long considered the backbone of scientific dating methods, has an 81.5 percent error rate.

Thermoluminescence (TL)

This method is used for dating inorganic artifacts like pottery shards, bronze and iron. TL is supposed to work because pottery, as well as bronze and iron artifacts, is exposed to great heat during manufacturing. The heat "cooks" out contaminant particles and extraneous electrons, leaving an uncontaminated object with a clock set to zero. Over time, the object is supposed to collect more electrons and particles at a known rate. When an artifact of this kind is again subjected to great heat, the electrons it has accumulated pop off photons of light. This glow is measured to determine a date for the artifact.

The chronology of history has
been built on radiocarbon dates
that have been selectively culled
to fit preconceptions.

TL is subject to contamination from radon gas, water, seasonal ground-temperature variations and other contaminants which are impossible to correct for, rendering it useless for supporting any given chronology. Other anomalies have been found regarding luminescence, brightness and radioactive decay that negatively impact the reliability of TL. It is commonly regarded as having a 20 percent margin of error. TL is good for telling whether an object has great age, but it cannot tell you how old the object is. TL may be good for applications like distinguishing between ancient artifacts and modern fakes, but it is useless for building accurate historical chronologies.

Stratigraphy

This method looks at the archeological contents of the different layers, or strata, of the ground. If objects are found in the same strata, they are assumed to come from the same time period, and this is used to help determine the historical chronology.

However, subjective effects erode the accuracy of stratigraphy. Consider the case of the early Bronze age Akkadians and the late Bronze age Mitanni. These ancient Syrian cultures are

thought to have lived 800 years apart, as has been believed since the nineteenth century. However, the Akkadian strata lies just beneath the Mitanni strata, which is impossible if there is a real 800-year gap. In 1988 scientists looked for evidence of an 800-year gap in the form of stratigraphic layers and windblown sediments, and found nothing. Yet the chronology has not been revised to show that the Akkadians and the Mitanni were contiguous inhabitants of ancient Syria. The evidence of stratigraphy has been ignored since it does not match the conventional chronology.

As with C-14 dating, when data disagrees with the theory, the data is ignored. What actually happened in ancient history? We may never know. But choosing data over theory would be a good place to start.

Recommended reading:

- Andy Coghlan, "Unexpected Errors Affect Dating Technique," *New Scientist* (September 30, 1989).
- J. Ogden, "The Use and Abuse of Radiocarbon," *Annals of the New York Academy of Science* 288 (New York, 1977).
- Gunnar Heinsohn, "Ancient Near Eastern Chronology Revised," *The Velikovskian* I: 1 (1993).

2004: The Year of the Gonzo

- The second Gonzo Science rock CD, *Gonzo Science: Conspiracy* is in the works.
- Early fall will see the launch of "The Gonzo Science Report," a half-hour live call-in show on PACT TV.
- Jim Richardson solo art show at the MAC, opening October 1, Music TBA
- In October, local dance company Semblesque opens their next show at the NorShor, based on Jim Richardson's rock CD *Gonzo Science*.
- The Richardson brothers will be major players at Duluth's first UFO convention on November 6. Watch this space for details.
- Buy the book *Gonzo Science*, now available at amazon.com, soon at area stores; buy the CD locally or follow the links from gonzoscience.com.