Radiometric Dating Versus The Bible
By Paul Nethercott

The Bible's View On The Age of the Earth

One thing that makes the Bible unique compared to other religious texts is its view on the age and origin of the Earth. In the fourth commandment [Exodus 20:8-11] God told the children of Israel that because He created the Earth in six days and rested on the seventh day they should work six days and rest on the seventh day. Nobody would ever think that he commanded them to work for millions of years and rest millions of years. In the creation week [Genesis 1:1-31] each day is called evening and morning [1:5, 1:8, 1:13, 1:19, 1:23, 1:31]. In the Bible evening and morning is always a 24 hour day. In Exodus 31:13-18 God told the children of Israel to keep the Sabbath because it is the same one in the creation week. Since human lifespan is only 80 years we could never keep a Sabbath millions of years long. A literal week [168 hours long] is what the Bible teaches

In the book of Isaiah [41:4, 64:4] the prophet clearly believed that humans have been on the planet since the beginning. The prophet Zechariah [12:1] tells us that God made Adam when He made the foundations of the Earth. Hebrews 1:10 tells us that He made the foundations of the Earth in the beginning. The time interval between the beginning [Genesis 1:1] and God creating Adam and Eve is five days or 120 hours.

In Matthew 19:4-6 and Mark 10:6-9 Jesus said that God made humans at the beginning [Genesis 1:1]. According to the Bible the age of the Earth is the age of mankind. According to the theory of evolution the Earth existed 4.5 billion years before the arrival of humans. In Luke 1:70 the Bible sates that God's holy prophets have been since the world began. If you accept the Earth is 4.5 billion years old that would mean humans have been here that long which is impossible. The Bible cannot be reconciled with an old Earth. Out of 6,000 years of Earth history man has been here for 99.9996804%. If we say that humans arrived 100 thousand years ago and you accept the Earth is 4.5 billion years old then man has been absent for 99.9999574% of Earth history.

The book of Luke [11:50, 51] tells us that God's prophets have been since the foundations of the world. Hebrews 1:10 tells us that this is the beginning. The age of the Earth is therefore the age of mankind. In Acts 3:26 the Bible sates that God's holy prophets have been since the world began.

Jesus said in John 8:44 that Satan tempted Adam and Eve in the beginning. The Bible states that there were 21 generations from Adam to Abraham [Luke 3:34-38]. From the creation week to the building of the pyramids [Genesis 12:15] could only be a few thousand years. Unless we say the Bible is complete rubbish we have to accept that the beginning is only a few thousand years ago. The apostle Paul tells us in Hebrews 4:3, 4 that all of God's creative work was finished at the foundations of the world. Hebrews 1:10 tells us that this is the beginning. This leaves no room for creating anything after the beginning. All of His creative work was done in the creation week. Nothing before or after.

Hebrews 9:26 tells us that sinners have been in existence since the foundations of the world. Since the foundations of the world were made at the beginning this means the age of the Earth is the age of mankind. The Bible tells us that there were no sinners before Adam and Eve [Romans 5:12, 1 Corinthians 15:22]. The creation of the Earth and the arrival of humans overlapped each other. There is no gap of millions of years. The last book of the Bible tells us that Jesus was the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" Revelation 13:8, 17:8. Since the foundation of the world were made in the beginning [Hebrews 1:10] this puts the age of the Earth and the entrance of sin at the same time. If the beginning were billions of years ago you would have sin before Adam and Eve.

Radiometric dates cannot contradict the evolutionary time model [1, 2, 3]. Earth rocks, Moon rocks and meteorites cannot be over 4.5 billion years old. Nothing in the Solar System can be over 4.5 billion years old. Nothing in the Milky Way Galaxy can be over 12 billion years old. Nothing in the universe can be over 15 billion years old. You cannot have rocks with future ages. Anything that exists in the present must have formed in the past and not in the future. Since radiometric dating affirms the Earth and life on Earth to have been in existence for billions of years it cannot be reconciled with the Bible.

Future Radiometric Dating

Rocks that exist in the present cannot have formed millions or billions of years in the future! Imagine someone telling you that Captain Cook had not discovered Australia yet. Rocks from Norway were dated [4] in 2009 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium method. The rock samples gave ages [4] between minus 31 billion and 76 billion years old! Since the Earth exists in the present how can the rocks have formed 31 billion years in the future? How can a rock be 60 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? The author admits impossible ages: "Re/Os model ages determined by LA-ICPMS from Fe–Ni sulfides (primarily pentlandite) scatter across the entire history of the Earth, and a few give meaningless future ages or ages older than the Earth." [4] He then admits: "The model ages show enormous scatter both within and between bodies and range from meaningless future dates to equally meaningless dates older than the Earth." [4] Of all the samples 20 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 8 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy, 7 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe and 19 have negative ages. [4] There is a 107.5 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Rock samples from South Africa were dated [5] in 2011 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium method. The rock samples gave ages [5] between minus 22 billion and 20 billion years old! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed 22 billion years in the future? How can a rock be 5 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? The author admits that the dates are impossible: "Type I eclogites show wide variations in model ages, from negative values to values much larger than the age of Earth. Sr model ages of Type I samples are all negative. Nd TCHUR ranges from -22.4 to 6.6 Ga, and Nd TDM from -2.3 to 8.1 Ga. Most of the Hf data give future ages; RV07-03, -18 and HRV247 give reasonable model ages, but the model ages of

RV07-16 are older than Earth itself." [5] There is a 42.3 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Rocks from eastern China were dated [6] in 2006 using the Rhenium/Osmium method. The rock samples give ages [6] between minus 87 billion to 40 billion years! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed 87 billion years in the future? How can a rock be 25 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? The author admits this major problem in four different places. [6] There is 127 billion year difference between the oldest [39 billion years] and the youngest [-87 billion years]. If the universe is only 13 billion years old how can there be such a wide range of ages?

There are mineral samples from central eastern China, [7] that have been dated in 2006 using the Rhenium/Osmium isotope systems. The author admits that the dates give several negative ages: "Ages (-6,900 to 7,330 Ma) of the Raobozhai peridotites vary widely from geologically meaningless to future ages." [7] The dating gave four impossible future ages. [7] According to Rhenium/Osmium isochron diagrams 39 for Xugou peridotites, the formation is 2 billion years old. There is a 14.2 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. Evolutionists claim that the Earth is only 4.5 billion years old so how can you have such a huge date range?

There are mineral samples from the Siberian and Slave Cratons, and the Massif Central, France, [8] that have been dated in 2010 using the Rhenium/Osmium isotope systems. According to Rhenium/Osmium isochron dates [8] the formation's true age is 2.3 to 3.6 billion years old. Many of the dates were impossible future ages: "Therefore, both TRD and TMA yield unrealistic ages (future or unreasonably old, respectively)." [8] There is a 14.8 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

There are rocks from North China were dated [9] in 2007 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Uranium/Lead dating methods. The rock samples gave ages [9] between -3 billion and 9 billion years old! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed 3 billion years in the future? How can a rock be 4.5 billion years older than the Earth? The author admits some of the dates are negative: "The Nd model ages for the individual data points are variable, from ~2.8 Ga to negative ages (Table 3), consistent with our earlier observation that REE patterns for all the samples display some degree of secondary metasomatic overprinting by LREE-enriched silicate melts." [9] There is a 12.7 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

There are rocks from Wyoming that were dated [10] in 2003 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium method. The rock samples gave ages [10] between -2 billion and 50 billion years old! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed 2 billion years in the future? How can a rock be 35 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? The author admits some of the dates are negative. There is a 52 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Rocks Older Than The Galaxy

Rock samples [11] from the Gas Hills in Wyoming were dated in 1979 using the Uranium-Lead method. The rock sample GH-B1 was dated giving ages [11] between -1.24 billion and 12 billion years old! The author admits: "These systematics are similar to those observed by Ludwig for the Shirley Basin uranium ores, for which preferential loss of radioactive daughters in the U decay chain was shown to be the dominant cause of apparent age discordance." [11] "The trends of apparent age and discordance of the total ore, uraninite-coffinite, and pyrite analyses for the Gas Hills and Crooks Gap ores are very similar to those reported for the Shirley Basin uranium ores." [11] Another group of rock samples were dated [11] giving absurd values. Many had negative ages! Some were older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. How can Earth rocks be older than the evolutionist age of Solar System? The Earth and Solar System are supposed to be 4.5 billion years old and the Galaxy 12 billion years old.

Kimberlites of southern Africa were dated in 1989 using Rhenium-Osmium dating method. [12] Some of the ages [12] are between 5.6 billion and 12.6 billion years old. This is older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System and galaxy.

Xenoliths from kimberlites intruding [13] the Siberian craton were dated in 1995 using the Rhenium/Osmium, Samarium/Neodymium, and Rubidium/Strontium dating methods. The results acquired using Rubidium-Strontium [13] isotope dating as being between 258 million and 12.7 billion years old. The dates obtained using Rhenium-Osmium dating method go from seventeen negative dates up to 11 billion years old. [13] The author admits: "If Re/Os model ages are calculated using the conventional model age approach, i.e., using the measured Re/OS and osmium isotope composition in comparison to some model for bulk-Earth osmium isotope evolution, several peridotites yield negative ages, or ages that are considerably older than the Earth" [13]

The Weekeroo Station iron meteorite was dated [14] in 1967 using the Potassium-Argon dating method. The author of the article begins with the following remarks: "The formation or solidification ages of iron meteorites have never been well determined. The most direct method seems to be that of Stoenner and Zahringer, who measured the potassium and argon contents by neutron-activation analysis. Their data, however, indicated ages of from about 7 billion to 10 billion years, whereas the age of the solar system is generally well accepted at about 4.7 billion years. Fisher later confirmed these data, but concluded that they were evidence of an unexplained potassium: argon anomaly rather than that they indicated true ages. From Muller and Zahringer's more recent data they conclude that a Potassium/Argon age of about 6.3 billion years can be assigned to many iron meteorites." [14] The author of the article then concludes with the following remarks: "The ages found by us are typical of the great ages found for most iron meteorites. From these, in conjunction with the Strontium/Rubidium data of Wasserburg on silicate inclusions in this meteorite, we conclude that the Potassium: Argon dating technique as applied to iron meteorites gives unreliable results. One may derive ad hoc possible explanations of the discord between the silicate and iron-phase ages, such as shock emplacement of these inclusions within the metal matrix without disturbing the potassium: argon ratios in the metal, but we feel that such mechanisms are unlikely." [14]

Donald Bogard from the Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas performed this dating [15] in 1990 using the Argon dating method. Three dates are as old, or older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy. Eleven are older than the evolutionist age of Solar System.

This dating was done in 1976 by scientists [16] from the United States Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado. The Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating [16] summary in the original essay gave impossible ages. Thirty one of the dates are older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. Four are over ten billion years. One date is older than the Big Bang explosion date.

These rocks from Japan were dated in 2005 using [17] the Argon 40 isotope method. The opening paragraph of this article states: "A laser fusion Ar-Ar technique applied on single crystals of kyanite from river sands of the Kitakami Mountain region of northeast Japan yielded ages of up to 16 Ga, more than three times the age of the earth. Although the age values are geologically meaningless, the ultra-high excess argon in kyanites is unique and hitherto unreported. We interpret this to be an artifact of ultra-high argon pressure derived from radiogenic argon in potassium-rich phases such as phengites during the Barrovian type retrogression of the ultra-high pressure rocks in this region." [17] The author concludes: "In this study, we report the results from fusion Ar-Ar technique on single crystals of kyanite recovered from river sands in the Kitakami region. However, the kyanites yielded ages that are two to three times older than the age of the earth." [17]

Impossible Radiometric Dates

These rocks from South Africa were dated in 2004 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples gave ages [18] between -279 billion and 79 billion years old! There is a 358 billion year [18] spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. Of the 374 dates, 92 [25%] are negative. The author admits in several places that many ages are impossibly old or young: "In some cases these define plausible ages (Fig. 8a) but in most the 'ages' are greater than the age of the Earth (Fig. 8b), and all of these correlations are regarded as mixing lines." [18] **Again:** "Both types of high-Fe samples have high proportions of sulfides with young to negative TRD ages." [18] "Negative model ages are meaningless numbers, and are plotted at increments of 0.1 Ga to illustrate the relative abundance of sulfides." [18]

These rocks from Northern China were dated [19] in 2010 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages [19] between -9 billion and 14 billion years old! There is a 23 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The rock samples in table 3 in the article gave ages between -3.8 and 10.6 billion years old! There is a 23 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The author admits in several places that many ages are impossibly old or young: "Whereas two samples give model ages close to, or even greater than, the age of the Earth." [19] "Other samples give TMA either older than the age of the Earth or a future age, suggesting a disturbance of the Re–Os isotope system in these samples." [19] **He also says:** "Thirteen Keluo mantle xenoliths yield impossible TMA model ages, i.e., negative or greater than the Earth's age, reflecting the modification of Re/Os ratios shortly before, during or since basalt entrainment." [19]

These rocks from western Norway were dated [20] in 2009 using the Samarium/Neodymium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages [20] between -64 billion and 76 billion years old! There is a 141 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The author admits in several places that many ages are impossibly old or young: "Re–Os model ages determined by LA-ICPMS from Fe–Ni sulfides (primarily pentlandite) scatter across the entire history of the Earth, and a few give meaningless future ages or ages older than the Earth." [20] He also says: "Table 2 lists model ages based on primitive (CHUR) and depleted (DM) mantle models. The model ages show enormous scatter both within and between bodies and range from meaningless future dates to equally meaningless dates older than the Earth." [20]

These rocks from eastern China were dated [21] in 2007 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages [21] between -47 billion and 39 billion years old! There is an 87 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. Out of the 348 dates, 72 (21%) were negative and 19 (5%) were older than the evolutionist age of the Earth. The author admits in several places that many ages are impossibly old or young: "Re/Os versus TMA and TRD model ages, showing how samples with higher Re/Os may give 'future' ages, or ages older than Earth." [21] He also says: "Many of the peridotites studied here contain several generations of sulfides, spanning from Archean to 'future' model ages." [21] "However, TMA calculations may yield both future ages and ages older than the Earth, because Re may be added to, or removed from, a xenolith by processes in the mantle and in the host basalt." [21]

These rocks from Sierra Leone were dated [22] in 2001 using the Rhenium/Osmium and Uranium/Lead dating method. The Uranium/Lead dating system gave an average age of 2.5 billion years. The Rhenium/Osmium dating system gave an average age of 8 billion years. The rock samples in the article gave ages [22] between 1.2 billion and 77 billion years old! There is a 76 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The author admits in several places that many ages are impossibly old or young: "For the high MgO samples, more than half of the Re/Os model ages are older than the age of the Earth, indicating they either experienced recent Re loss or gain of radiogenic Os." [22] He also says: "Five out of 13 of the low MgO samples also have Re/Os model ages older than the Earth." [22]

These rocks from north Queensland were dated [23] in 2010 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages [23] between -24 billion and 8.6 billion years old! There is a 33 billion year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. Out of the 54 dates, 13 (24%) were negative and two were older than the evolutionist age of the Earth.

Rocks Older Than The Solar System

Rock samples from the Marble Bar area of the Pilbara Craton, Western Australia, were dated [24] in 2011 using the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating methods. The article claims that the true age is 3.4 billion years old. [24] If we put the ratios from a table [24] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot [25] we get ages between 5 billion and 100 billion years old! How can a rock be 85 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? Of all the samples, 45 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 23 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy and 17 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe. There is a 75 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

Rock samples from the Morocco and France were dated [26] in 2007 using the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating methods. If we put the ratios from a table [26] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot we get ages between 2 and 92 billion years old! How can a rock be 75 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? Of all the samples, 53 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 13 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy and 6 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe. There is a 90 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

Rock samples from the Kola Peninsula in Russia were dated [27] in 2011 using the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating methods. The article claims that the true age is 2075–2100 million years old. [27] If we put the ratios from a table [27] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot we get ages between 2 and 10 billion years old! Of all the samples, 24 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 2 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy. There is an 8 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

Rock samples from the Democratic Republic of Congo were dated [28] in 2009 using the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating methods. The article claims that the true age is 520 million years old. [28] If we put the ratios from a table [28] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot we get ages between 0.1 and 200 billion years old! How can a rock be 185 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? Of all the samples, 96 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 42 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy and 35 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe. There is a 198 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

This Martian meteorite was dated [29] in 2011 using the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating methods. The article claims that the true age is 4.1 billion years old. [29] If we put the ratios from a table [29] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot we get ages between 161 million and 165 billion years old! There is 103 thousand percent difference between the youngest and oldest dates. How can a rock be 150 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? Of all the samples 11 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe. There is a 165 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

Rock samples from the North China Craton were dated [30] in 2001 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium dating methods. The article claims [30] that the true age was determined to be 125 million years old. If we put the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead ratios from a table [30] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot we get ages between 5 and 44 billion years old! How can a rock be 30 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? Of all the samples, 40 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 15 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy and 12 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe. There is a 40 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

Rock samples from Western Australia were dated [31] in 2001 using the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating methods. The article claims that the true age is 3 billion years old. [31] If we put the ratios from a table [31] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot we get ages between 2 million and 24 billion years old! How can a rock be 10 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? There is a 1,199,949% difference between the youngest and oldest dates. Of all the samples, 18 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 3 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy and 2 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe. There is a 24 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

Rock samples from the North Flinders Ranges, South Australia, were dated [32] in 2010 using the Uranium/Lead and Thorium/Lead dating methods. The article claims that the true age is 400 million years old. [32] If we put the ratios from a table [32] in the article into Microsoft Excel and run the values through Isoplot we get ages between 190 thousand and 20 billion years old! There is a 10,643,286% difference between the youngest and oldest dates. How can a rock be 5 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? Of all the samples, 6 are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, 3 are older than the evolutionist age of the Galaxy and 2 are older than the evolutionist age of the Universe. There is a 20 billion year spread of dates between the youngest and the oldest ages.

Rocks Older Than The Earth

These rock samples from Broken Hill were dated [33] in 1981 using the ^{40}Argon/^{39}Argon dating method. According to the dates obtained, many of the rocks are older than the Earth and Solar System. Some of the rocks are as old as the evolutionist age of galaxy. The author of the article comments: "Excess 40Ar was incorporated into minerals during the 520-Ma event at a temperature of about 350°C." [33] There is no way of proving this assumption. It is just an excuse for such ridiculous ages of geological system that supposedly formed between 1,600 and 500 million years ago. [33] The data in the original article shows ten have ages greater than the evolutionist age Earth and forty five [33] have ages greater than the evolutionist age Solar System. They range from 413 million up to ten billion years old.

This dating on the Allende meteorite was done in 1983 [34] and gave ages between 3 and 8.8 billion years old. [34] The author discusses the problem and proposed solutions: "The existence in the Allende meteorite of coarse-grained Ca-Al-rich inclusions (CAI) with 40Ar/39Ar apparent ages exceeding the age of the solar system was reported by Jessberger and Dominik and Jessberger et al. and confirmed by Herzog et al." In 1980 Herzog in did more dating and gave three possible reasons [35] why the dates are in such conflict with the standard evolutionary model.

Some radiometric dating [36] that was done on some Moon rocks by Oberli in 1978 gave absurd ages. Oberli states [36] that the Uranium/Thorium/Lead data is concordant but the Neodymium dates are uncertain. Again it is just an arbitrary choice he makes as to which date is certain and which date is not. The dates range from 4.2 to 8.3 billion years. According to the evolutionist view the Moon is only 4.5 billion years old.

This article about the Allende meteorite appeared [37] in Nature magazine in 1979. Jessberger admits that the wildly discordant ages cannot be due to normal processes: "In the Allende meteorite several elements are found to have an isotopic composition that cannot be due to radioactive or spallation or fractionation processes." [37] Some of his explanations are totally unprovable: "In the most widely accepted theory a supernova triggered the collapse of the solar nebula, and the anomalously high ages would be due to an enhanced $^{40}K/^{39}K$ isotopic ratio produced in the explosive carbon burning shell of the supernova? In another, controversial interpretation these ages could have chronological significance, as here the presolar grains are relicts from various old stellar nucleosynthetic and condensation processes unrelated to the formation of the Solar System." [37] He then quotes several [37] science journals for an explanation. He thinks the ages could be residue from an ancient supernova or contamination for pre galactic dust not related to the formation of the Solar System. Again, like Oberli his solution is totally unprovable. How would you test such a hypothesis? Some of the dates are older than the evolutionist age of the galaxy. How do we know that Earth rocks have not been contaminated in such a way? During the formation of the Solar System, the Earth might have absorbed such materials. His choice of "true" ages is just guess and not provable science. The two tables in his article have fifty two dates ranging from 1.46 to 11 billion years old. Forty seven are greater than the evolutionist age Solar System. Twenty seven dates are over five billion years old.

These rock samples from Mount Isa, Queensland were dated in 2006 by Mark Kendrick [38] from the University of Melbourne. The data in his article [38] shows ages of Earth rocks from 4.7 to 10 billion years old. One is as old as the evolutionist age of the Milky Way Galaxy. Eight are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth and eighteen are older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System.

Rocks Older Than The Universe

These rock samples from Black Hills, South Dakota were dated in 1970 giving ridiculous dates. The oldest is one trillion years old! That is sixty times older than the Big Bang explosion. The article simply says: "Anomalous age data for pegmatite minerals." [39]

This rock was from the Great Northern Peninsula, Newfoundland. It was dated in 1974 as being 18 billion years old. As the article says: "The most striking of these is the consistent pattern of anomalously high apparent ages obtained for high temperature fractions (i.e. fraction s corresponding to temperatures > 925-950°C). These anomalously high apparent ages almost certainly reflect the presence of excess radiogenic argon." The table in the article [40] lists eleven rock samples with radical discordant dates. The first two rocks have internal ages varying between the "youngest" and "oldest" by a factor of 2,000% and 1,000% respectively.

Some of these rocks have been dated to be between eight million and eighty billion years old. [41] That is five times older than the Big Bang explosion! These rocks from Yucca Mountain, Nevada were dated in 2008 by Uranium–Thorium–Lead dating method. Some of the dates are almost two million percent discordant. That means that the dating methods can give ages for the same rock that vary by a factor of 20,000. One part of the rock is dated as being 20,000 times older than another. The error range of 180 billion years allows the rocks to have a maximum age of 260 billion years.

This dating was done in 1990 on rocks from the Ouzzal granite unit in Algeria. Maluski used Argon dating and it gave dates over 22 billion years old.[42] Maluski comments: "Apparent ages as old as l0-11 Ga are obtained between 450 and 1,100 C, which implies that the excess component is widely distributed over all the sites without a preferential location. The internal age discordance is mainly due to the low amount and ariability of 39Ar released at each temperature increment. This is probably because K occurs as microscopic impurities within pyroxene, the degassing of which is very irregular." [42] Seventy six dates were older than the evolutionist age of the Earth/Solar System. Forty dates were over ten billion years old. Seven dates were older that the Big Bang explosion.

The article describes Rubidium-Strontium dating of volcanic rocks in the Highwood Mountains and Eagle Buttes, Montana, U.S.A. This was performed in 1994. Ages [43] greater than the Big Bang date [15.5 billion years old] were obtained. The author comments: "These extreme isotopic characteristics are accompanied by parent daughter ratios that give all the Highwood peridotites old model ages (Rb-Sr, 2.14-15.5 Ga; Sm-Nd, 2.78-6.83 Ga; Table 1) compared to the other ultramafic samples." [43]

Meteorite Dating

The Acapulco Meteorite was dated in 1997 by scientists from France and Germany. Four of the dates [44] are older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System and two are as old as the evolutionist age of galaxy. We shall soon see that this is quite common for dating these rocks.

This article summarised meteorite dating in 1967 by scientist from New York and Florida. [45] Even 30 years later things are no better. In the opening paragraph he states that the iron meteorite from Weekeroo Station is dated at ten billion years old. The article gives eight dates ranging from 4.7 to 10 billion years old. He then continues: "The formation or solidification ages of iron meteorites have never been well determined." [45] He then cites earlier dating which produced an age of seven billion years. [45] The author concludes with the following remark: "The ages found by us are typical of the great ages found for most iron meteorites. From these, in conjunction with the Strontium: Rubidium data of Wasserburg et al. on silicate inclusions in this meteorite, we conclude that the potassium: argon dating technique as applied to iron meteorites gives unreliable results." [45]

The Allende meteorite was dated in 2007 by scientists from Australia and America using the $^{206}Pb/^{238}U$ dating method. [46] Over ten dates older than the age of the evolutionist age of the Solar System were produced and one was as old as the evolutionist age of the galaxy. [46]

Scientists from France used both $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ and Rhenium-Osmium method were used to date the iron meteorite Kodaikanal in 1998. [47] Dates in the essay [47] of the Canyon Diablo meteorite vary from one to fourteen billion years old. There is a 1,200% difference between the youngest and oldest date obtained for the one rock.

This meteorite consisting of approximately equal mixtures of metal and silicate was dated in 1990 by Scientists from the NASA Johnson Space Center, Houston, Texas. [48] Eleven of the sixteen meteorites dated gave ages older than the Solar System and three dated as being as being as old as the evolutionist age of the galaxy. [48] According to one table the supposed true age is just 3.5 billion years old. [48]

Dated in 2009 by scientists [49] from Germany and Russia, these meteorite samples gave astounding results. Forty four dates were older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. Nine were as old as the evolutionist age of galaxy and one older than the Big Bang. [49] Most age results were hundreds or thousands of percent discordant.

Dated in 1997 by scientists [50] from Germany and France, these meteorite samples gave astounding results also. Fourteen dates were older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. Three were as old as the evolutionist age of the galaxy and one was as old as the Big Bang. [50] Most age results that were hundreds or thousands of percent discordant with each other.

If we compare the dates above with the dating done in 1958 we see that meteorite dating has not improved in fifty years! Six meteorites were dated in 1958 by scientists from Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York. [51] Seventeen dates were older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. Five dates were as old as the evolutionist age of the galaxy. These dates [51] are just as stupid as the previous examples. The choice of 4.5 billion years as an "absolute" value is purely and arbitrary choice.

The Allende and Orgueil meteorites were dated in 1976 by scientists from the United States Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado. [52] Six dates were over ten billion years old. [52] Two dates were as old as the Big Bang explosion. [52] Fifty two dates were over five billion years. [52] The Allende gave a maximum age of 4.84 billion years and a minimum of seventy million years old.

This dating was done in 2005 by scientists from USA and Canada. The material dated is an asteroid fragment from the meteorite Richardton. [53] Five dates listed in the article were over five billion years old. [53] The true ages is supposed to be 4.5 billion years old. If we run the atomic ratios in table one through Isoplot we find the Uranium 238 dating gives an average age of 5.2 billion years and the maximum age as ten billion years old.

This dating of three different meteorites was done in 2008 by scientists from Australia and Canada. The Lead/Lead dates were very uniform but the $^{206}Lead/^{238}Uranium$ dates gave eight dates were over five billion years old. [54] Thirteen were dated as being older than the evolutionist age of Solar System.

Dating done in 1980 of eight different meteorites gave many discordant values. [55] The discordance between different dates for the same meteorite varied from 120 percent to 8,000 percent! Six of the eight rocks gave ages over five billion years old. Meteorites Lubbock and Arapahoe both have maximum and minimum ages between 100 million and ten billion years old. How can the dating method be accurate and give such a range for one rock?

This dating was done in 1983 by scientists from the NASA, Johnson Space Center, Houston Texas and the U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado. [56] A summary of Argon dating done on different meteorite samples shows two are over five billion years old. The original article has undated $_{207}Pb/_{206}Pb$ ratios. If we run the through Isoplot we find the ratios give the uniform age of 5.3 billion years. All are much older than the evolutionist age of the solar system.

These asteroid samples were dated in 2003 by scientists from the NASA Johnson Space Center, Houston, Texas, and the Lockheed-Martin Corporation, Houston, Texas. [57] Ten of the twenty six meteorites were dated as being over five billion years old. When scientists date a rock they get numerous dates for the one meteorite. If we look at the maximum and minimum age obtained for each meteorite we find that there is between 500 million and six billion years difference between the oldest and youngest dates. That means there can be between 20 and 2500 percent discordance dating the one rock.

These samples from Texas were dated in 2001 by scientists from the NASA Johnson Space Center, Houston, Texas, and the Lockheed-Martin Corporation, Houston, Texas. [58] The author comments: "Although the Monahans light and dark silicate samples show complex age spectra, we believe that their interpretation is straightforward." The Monahans chondrite and halite was dated in 2001 as being over eight billion years old. The mineral samples gave three different date ranges 2.5 to 4.6 billion years, 3.9 to 8 billion years and 1.1 to 5.7 billion years.

These samples were dated in 1967 by the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California. [59] Even after 40 years of research and the massive improvement in laboratory equipment and computer technology, things today are just as bad as back then! Thirteen of the dates are five billion years or more. Twenty one were older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. [59]

Scientist from the Max-Planck-Institute, Heidelberg, Germany, dated these Allende meteorites samples in 1980. [60] Seven samples were dated as being over five billion years old. Thirteen dates were older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. [60] Twenty dates were over five billion years old.

These meteorite fragments from the Morokweng crater, South Africa were dated in 2010 by scientists from Australia, South Africa, England and Finland. [61] The dates for the one meteorite varied from 174 million to 11.25 billion years old. The oldest date is sixty four times older than the youngest date. Some dates are over 4,000 percent discordant. The oldest date is as old as the evolutionist age of the galaxy. [61]

Concordia Isochron Dating

Theses rock samples from the Bohemian Massif, South East Germany [62] were dated in 2010 using the Uranium-Lead dating method. The table in the essay has three columns of isotopic ratios, $^{206}Pb/^{238}U$, $^{207}Pb/^{235}U$ and $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$. You will notice in Table 4 the original article [62] that there are dates besides the $^{206}Pb/^{238}U$ and $^{207}Pb/^{235}U$ ratios but no dates beside the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios. The true age is supposed to be about four million years old. The first two sets of ratios and dates agree with each other between 94 and 101 percent accuracy. If we use the computer program Isoplot and calculate the ages of the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios we see why not dates have been put beside them. Twenty two of the fifty seven dates are negative. They range from -133 to 281 million years old. That is logically impossible. How can the rock have formed millions of years in the future? We can see that the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ dates are between 1,000 to 21,000 percent discordant when compared to the two Uranium-Lead dating methods. Here is just one of many times where geology journals use selective evidence to try and prove evolution. If the third column or ratios were dated and added to the essay you can see how silly it would look.

These rock samples from North America were dated in 2002 using both [63] Potassium-Argon and Lead-Lead dating methods. Again the no dates beside the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios. According to the Potassium-Argon dating method the rocks are 1,740 million years old. The first table in his article has dates [63] using the $^{40}Ar/^{39}Ar$ dating method. The third table [63] has the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios. If we use the computer program Isoplot and calculate the ages of the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios we see why not dates have been put beside them. The Potassium-Argon and Lead-Lead dating methods are extremely discordant. The $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios give dates between 1.8 and 5 billion years old. The author's use of data is very selective. Dates that agree are added and those that do not are omitted. This happens over and over in geology magazines. We can see that many dates are older than the evolutionist view of the age of Earth. How can such an absurdity be possible? How can the Earth be older than itself?

This dating [64] was done in 1999 on meteorite samples by the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Hiroshima University in Japan. The isotopic ratios take from Table 2 in the original article have no dates beside them. [64] Using the computer program Isoplot we calculate the ages of the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios we see why not dates have been put beside them. The $^{206}Pb/^{238}U$ ratios give ages between 1.2 and 3.5 billion years old. According to the first three Iscohron [1, 2 and 3] diagrams in the article [64] the meteorites are only supposed to be 200 million years old! The $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios give thirteen dates of 4.9 to 5 billion years old. This means that the dates are 4.8 billion years in error. The ratio of the so called "true" age versus the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ age is 25 to 1. The author deliberately chose not to put the dates beside the isotopic ratios because they would show how utterly ridiculous the whole system is. According to the Iscohron diagram in the article, the maximum error level is only 83 million years. The error level is 4,934 years if we compare it to the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ age. This means the error level is 59 times in error.

The meteorite samples [65] were dates in 2009 by scientists form the Geological Museum, the University of Copenhagen and the University of Texas at Austin. If we use Isoplot and run some of the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios given in the article [65] through Microsoft Excel we see that many of the ratios produce ages over 5 billion years old. A Concordia diagram taken from the article [65] that shows the age of the rock is supposed to be 4.56 billion years old. The diagram claims that the error margins is only 810 thousand years! If we add the $^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb$ ratios dates we can see that the diagram is out by 550 million years. That means the error margin given in the diagram is 677 times to short!

Very Old Rocks

These samples were dated in the year 2000 [66] by scientists from the University of Manchester, University College London and the University of Glasgow in Scotland. Samples were taken from different diamond mines in Canada (Fox, Grizzly, Leslie and Koala), the Democratic Republic of Congo and from Botswana (Jwaneng). The article states that "apparent ages for most diamonds are greater than the age of the Earth." [66] Twenty one dates in this table [66] are indeed older than the theory of evolution would allow. Fourteen are over six billion years old. The article admits that many dates are meaningless: "all apparent ages are higher than the host kimberlite eruption ages and most are higher than the 4.5 Ga geochron." [66]

This dating on Moon rocks was done in 1998 by scientists from the University of Manchester in England. "The Luna 24 mission returned 160 cm of core (0.17 kg) from the south eastern rim of Mare Crisium in August 1976." [67] Nineteen samples from this Russian space probe were dates by Argon dating as being older than the evolutionist age of the Moon. [67] "The presence of trapped Ar components is evident from the anomalously high apparent ages determined from the measured 40Ar/39Ar values for the initial 30-40% of K release." [67] "Interpretation of the apparent ages is problematic because neither the clast composition nor the proportions of clast and matrix in the analysed splits could be determined." The current consensus among evolutionists is that the true age of the Moon is 4.5 billion years old. [67]

"Northwest Africa 482 (NWA 482) is the second largest lunar meteorite and the fifth found in the Sahara. The complete stone had a mass of 1.015 kg before cutting." [68] In 2002 it was dated by scientists from the Lunar and Planetary Laboratory, University of Arizona. The results of the dating [68] are seven dates between 5.7 and 9.9 billion years old. The author of the article explains why he thinks that the ages are so absurd: "We believe that this ^{40}Ar is probably dominated by terrestrial contamination." [68]

These rock samples from the King Leopold ranges in Western Australia were dated in 2010 by scientists from the Department of Geological Sciences, University of Cape Town, South Africa and the Department of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington. [69] The difference between the oldest and youngest dates [69] is 16.2 billion years. They range from -8.3 billion to 7.4 billion years old. The author of the article explains why he thinks that the ages are so absurd: "The chalcopyrite inclusion from EL57 gives a model age older than the age of the Earth, evidence, perhaps, that this sulphide has suffered Re loss." [69]

This dating was done in 1983 by scientists from the Geophysical Institute, University of Tokyo. [70] Twenty seven dates are older than the evolutionist age of the Earth and nineteen are over 5 billion years old. [70] The author blames Argon contamination for the bizarre dates that were obtained: "Because of the extremely small amount of argon, the hot blank corrections were similar to or even larger than the argon in the diamonds, resulting in a large uncertainty in the experimental results." [70] The author admits that the dates are absolutely meaningless: "The apparent K-Ar ages range from 150 million to nine billion years, indicating that the non radiogenic 40Ar is significant. Since we have no way to make a correction for the non-radiogenic 40Ar, the apparent K-Ar age does not offer useful information on the age of the diamonds." [70] Whichever date the author accepts is simply an arbitrary choice. Any date is just as good as any other date.

This dating was done in 2008 by scientists from the Department of Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta, Canada and from the Department of Earth Sciences and The Open University in England. [71] Two meteorites (Allan Hills and Northwest Africa) were dated and fourteen dates are over five billion years old. This is older than the evolutionist age of the Earth. [71] The article admits that the dates are meaningless: "The most striking observation is that all of NWA 1950 shock melt data, and more than half of the ages derived from ALH 77005 shock melts, are impossibly ancient, older than the Solar System itself (4.567 Ga; Fig. 6). Moreover, ancient ages (>4.567 Ga) from shock melts are known in meteorites, in particular the Peace River L6 chondrite, studied by Ar–Ar stepped heating and localized outgassing by a laser probe (McConville et al., 1988)." [71] The article concludes with the following remarks: **"**Our Ar–Ar results for shock melts—ages in >4.567 Ga and 40Ar/36Ar ratios that overlap with previous measurements of the Martian atmosphere—indicate that shock melt 'ages' are meaningless in terms of any real event.**" [71]**

Scientists from the University of Cape Town, South Africa and the Carnegie Institution of Washington preformed this dating in 2003 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. [72] The dates range from -13 billion to 18 billion years old. There is a 31.6 billion year range between the oldest and youngest dates. [72] "Thus, the Re–Os model ages, when calculated relative to a mantle undergoing chondritic Os isotopic evolution, are considerably older, varying from 3.1 to 18.5Ga (see Table 3 for calculation parameters). Model ages older than the age of the Earth are a clear indication that at least some of the samples have not experienced the simple single-stage Re–Os evolution required by the model age calculation. The unrealistically old Re–Os model ages reflect Re/Os ratios too low to account for the high measured 187Os/188Os." [72] The author concluded the article with the following remarks: "The scatter in Re–Os systematics reflects a complex history for these eclogites that makes it impossible to define a precise age.**" [72]**

These samples were dated in the year 2000 by Geologists from the University Of Montreal, Canada and from the Earth and Planetary Sciences Department, McGill University, Canada. [73] The samples were taken from mountain ranges near the Canadian/Alaskan border. [73] Fifteen of the dates are negative or future ages. The author admits: "The decoupling of 187Re/188Os and 187Os/188Os observed in the Canadian Cordillera xenolith data also affects the calculation of Os model ages, and leads to "future" ages or ages older than the Earth (Table 1)." [73] Because the data is so bad the author admits: "Because of the apparent perturbation of the Re/Os ratios, age information cannot be obtained from an isochron diagram." [73] How can a rock that exists in the present have formed millions of years in the future? Such a proposition is illogical.

These samples from Canada were dated in 2010 by scientists from the Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. [74] Some of the specimens were dated to be over 5.5 billion years old. [74] The author tells how the isochron gave absurd ages: "In contrast, the most radiogenic sulphides in sample 1636 plot about an impossible 5 Ga model isochron." [74] The admission is that the dates are impossible and meaningless: "The Re–Os isotope systematics of sulphides in sample 1636 are disturbed (Fig. 6e), with three of four samples falling on an impossible 5 Ga model isochron." [74]

The California Institute of Technology, (Pasadena, California) dated these Lunar rocks in 1972. [75] Eighty one dates are older than the evolutionist age of the Solar System. Sixty three are over five billion years old. Seven are over six billion years old. [75] The author comments on the major problems with dating these samples: "The data for all highland soils analyzed here are shown in fig. 4. All five data points lie far above the concordia curve and give ages for a single stage model which are in excess of 4.6 AE (see table 5). The ^{206}Pb-^{238}U ages range up to 5.83 AE. The ^{207}Pb-^{206}Pb ages are also very high." [75] His calculations confirm the wrong ages radiometric dating gives: "Inspection of rows D and E in table 5 shows the extreme limits of the ^{207}Pb-^{206}Pb ages. All highland soils analyzed have ^{207}Pb-^{206}Pb model ages in excess of 4.90 AE. These are the highest values observed so far for samples of 'total lunar soil'." [75]

Rock samples from the Lower Onverwacht Volcanics in Barberton Mountain Land, South Africa were dated in 1992 by geologists from the Department of Physics, University of Toronto, and the Department of Geological Sciences, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. [76] Twenty dates were over five billion years old. The youngest date was -4.5 x 10^{16} years. [76] How can a rock that exists in the present have formed 4,500 trillion years in the future? Such a proposition is illogical. Two other samples gave future ages of -310 billion and -56 billion years old.

In 1998 diamond samples were dated by scientist from the Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, Germany, the Max-Planck Institute Chemistry, and the Centre Geochemistry, Strasbourg, France. [77] According to the author the true ages is 2.7 billion years: "All three isotopic systems of whole rocks indicate ages of ~2.7 Ga, much younger than the depositional age of the successions." [77] "By treating the primary isochron slope of the Pb-isotopic data of sample OG 1 as a secondary isochron, an additional recalculation of the ^{208}Pb/^{204}Pb isotopic values indicates that the 232Th/238U (k) isotopic ratio of sample OG 1 has had a value of 4.78 from~2.7 Ga, which is slightly higher than the typical k value of ~4 (Taylor and McLennan, 1985)." [77] When we run the ^{207}Pb/^{206}Pb ratios listed [77] in the essay through Isoplot we get uniform dates of 4.5 billion years old, almost 2 billion years older. A radically different answer! Again the authors choice of true age is just random.

The Thorium Lead Dating Method

These samples were dated in 1998 by scientists from the School Of Ocean And Earth Science And Technology, University Of Hawaii, Honolulu. According to this article the samples were taken from volcanic material that is only 100 million years old. [78] If we put isotopic ratios [78] into Microsoft Excel and run the through Isoplot we find the average age is almost 17 billion years old. The Lead/Lead dating gives fifty nine dates that are between 4.9 and 5 billion years old. The Uranium-238 method gives twenty six dates over five billion years old and four over ten billion years old. The Thorium-232 method gives forty five dates over five billion years old, thirty six over ten billion years old and twenty over twenty billion years old. [78]

These samples were dated in 1998 by scientists from the Department Of Earth, Atmospheric And Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute Of Technology. According to this article the samples were taken from the volcanic crust of the Kerguelen Archipelago that is only 30 million years old. [79] If we put isotopic ratios [79] into Microsoft Excel and run the through Isoplot we find the average age of Mount Bureau is over 5 billion years old. There are seventy eight dates for Mount Bureau between two and forty four billion years old. Fifty six are over 5 billion years old. There are forty dates for Mount Rabouillere between 2.8 and 7.8 billion years old. Twenty eight are over 5 billion years old.

These samples were dated in 2004 by scientists from the Department Of Earth Sciences, The Open University, England. According to this article the samples were are only 25 million years old: "Most samples are Miocene in age, ranging from 10 to 25Ma in the south and 19Ma to the present day in northern Tibet." [80] If we run the $^{87}Rb/^{86}Sr$ ratios [14] in the essay through Isoplot we get dates between 1 and 24 million years. If we run the Uranium/Lead ratios [80] in the essay through Isoplot we get unbelievable dates. The North Tibet dates vary between 5 and 88 billion years old. Eighteen are over 5 billion years old. The South Tibet dates vary between 230 million and 33 billion years old. Twelve are over 5 billion years old

These samples were dated in 2007 by scientists from the Chinese Academy Of Sciences, Wushan, Guangzhou. According to this article the samples were are only 55 million years old: "The initial Sr, Nd and Pb isotopic ratios were corrected using the Ar/Ar age of 55Ma." [81] If we run the Uranium/Lead ratios [81] in the essay through Isoplot we get twenty four unbelievable dates between 5 and 10 billion years old.

In 2005 scientists from the School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology, University of Hawaii, Honolulu dated these rocks. According to this article the samples were are only 140 million years old: "Isotopic data for such sites show that mantle similar to that beneath the modern Indian Ocean was present, at least in places, as long ago as 140 Ma, the age of the oldest true Indian Ocean crust yet sampled." [82] If we run the Rubidium/Strontium ratios [82] through Isoplot we see that the average age is 168 million years. [Table 6] If we run the Uranium/Lead ratios [82] through Isoplot we get 210 dates between 1 billion and 58 billion years old. One hundred and sixty four dates are over five billion years old. Seventy five dates are over ten billion years old. Thirty two dates are over twenty billion years old.

These rocks form south west Tibet were dated in 1998 by scientist from Austria. According to this article the samples were are only 25 million years old: "Major and trace element, Sr–Nd–Pb–O isotope and mineral chemical data are presented for post-collisional ultrapotassic, silicic and high-K calc-alkaline volcanic rocks from SW Tibet, with 40Ar/39Ar ages in the range 17–25 Ma." [83] If we run the Rubidium/Strontium ratios [25] through Isoplot we see that the average age is 43 million years. If we run the Uranium/Lead ratios [26] through Isoplot we see that thirteen dates are over five billion years old and six are over fifty billion years old.

References

Introduction
1   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_the_universe
2   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_the_Earth
3   http://arxiv.org/pdf/astro-ph/0506458v1.pdf

Future Radiometric Dating
4   Lithos, Volume 117, 2010, Pages 6, 7, 11
5   Lithos, Volume 142-143, 2012, Pages 169
6   Lithos, Volume 102, 2008, Pages 43, 46-50, 52, 53
7   Chemical Geology, Volume 236, 2007, Pages 331, 332, 334
8   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2002, Volume 66, Number 6, Pages 1045, 1046, 1047
9   Chemical Geology, Volume 248, 2008, Pages 46, 54
10   Lithos, Volume 77, 2004, Pages 458, 460, 466

Rocks Older Than The Galaxy
11   Economic Geology, 1979, Volume 74, Pages 1658, 1661-1664
12   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 1989, Volume 53, Page 1588, 1591
13   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 1995, Volume 59, Number 5, Page 968, 970, 971
14   Science, 1967, Volume 155, Pages 999 - 1000
15   Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1990, Volume 54, Pages 2563 – 2564
16   Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1976, Volume 40, pages 617 – 634
17   Gondwana Research, 2005, Volume 8, Number 4, Pages 617-621

Impossible Radiometric Dates
18   **Chemical Geology, Volume 208, 2004, Pages 101-105, 107, 110**
19   **Lithos, Volume 126, 2011, Pages 241, 242, 239, 244**
20   **Lithos, Volume 117, 2010, Pages 6, 7, 11**
21   **Lithos, Volume 102, 2008, Pages 46-50, 52, 53, 61**
22   **Precambrian Research, Volume 118, 2002, Pages 273, 274, 276, 277**
23   **Lithos, Volume 125, 2011, Pages 415, 417**

Rocks Older Than The Solar System
24   **Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 2012, Volume 319-320, Pages 199**
25   **http://www.bgc.org/isoplot_etc/isoplot.html**
26   **Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2009, Volume 73, Pages 475, 476**
27   **Lithology and Mineral Resources, 2011, Volume 46, Number 2, Pages 156, 158**
28   **Mineral Deposita, 2010, Volume 45, Pages 393, 394, 397, 398**
29   **Journal Of Geophysical Research, 2011, Volume 116, Page 6, 7**
30   **Contributions Mineral Petrology, 2002, Volume 144, Pages 243, 246**
31   **International Earth Science, 2002, Volume 91, Pages 414, 416, 423**
32   **Economic Geology, 2011, Volume 106, Pages 846, 866**

Rocks Older Than The Earth
33   **Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 1981, Volume 55, Pages 124, 128-133, 137, 141, 147**
34   **Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 1983, Volume 63, Pages 1, 5**
35   **http://www.lpi.usra.edu/meetings/lpsc1980/pdf/1155.pdf**
36   **http://www.lpi.usra.edu/meetings/lpsc1978/pdf/1289.pdf**
37   **Nature, 1979, Volume 277, Pages 554 - 556**
38   **Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2006, Volume 70, Pages 2573-2575**

Rocks Older Than The Universe
39   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1970, Volume 34, pages 721.**
40   **Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 1974, Volume 22, Pages 260**
41   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 2008, Volume 72, Pages 2080, 2081**
42   **Chemical Geology, 1990, Volume 80, pages 201 - 204**
43   **Earth And Planetary Science Letters, 1994, Volume 126, Page 460, 465**
44   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1997, Volume 61, Number 16, Pages 3500**
45   **Science, 1967, Volume 155, Pages 999 - 1000**
46   **Meteoritics And Planetary Science, 2007, Volume 42, Numbers 7/8, Pages 1321 – 1335**
47   **Meteoritics And Planetary Science, 1998, Volume 33, Pages 649**
48   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1990, Volume 54, pages 2563, 2564, 2551**
49   **Meteoritics And Planetary Science, 2009, Volume 44, Number 2, Pages 316-321**
50   **Meteoritics And Planetary Science, 1997, Volume 32, Pages 664-670**
51   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1958, Volume 15, Pages 45–46**
52   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1976, Volume 40, Pages 627**
53   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 2005, Volume 69, Number 2, pages 509**
54   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 2008, Volume 72, Pages 225**
55   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 1980, Volume 44, Pages 1670-1671**
56   **Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 1983, Volume 62, Pages 135, 138–139**
57   **Meteoritics And Planetary Science, 2003, Volume 38, Number 5, Pages 669–710**
58   **Meteoritics And Planetary Science, 2001, Volume 36, Pages 107-122**
59   **Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 1967, Volume 2, Pages 397-408**
60   **Icarus, 1980, Volume 42, pages 380 - 405**
61   **Geochemica Et Cosmochemica Acta, 2010, Volume 74, Pages 1738–1739**

Concordia Isochron Dating
62   **Geomorphology, 2010, Volume 117, Pages 58**
63   **Precambrian Research, 2002, Volume 117, Pages 128, 133**
64   **Mereoritics And PIanetary Science, 2000, Volume 35, Pages 342, 343, 344**
65   **Chemical Geology, 2009, Volume 259, Pages 145, 147**

Very Old Rocks
66   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2000, Volume 64, Number 4, Pages 724, 725
67   Meteoritics & Planetary Science, 1998, Volume 33, Pages 925, 929, 932-935
68   Meteoritics & Planetary Science, 2002, Volume 37, Page 1797, 1805, 1806
69   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2010, Volume 74, Pages 3296, 3297
70   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 1983, Volume 47, Pages 2220, 2221
71   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2008, Volume 72, Pages 5826-5827, 5832
72   Lithos, 2003, Volume 71, Pages 329, 331, 333
73   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2000, Volume 64, Number 17, Pages 3063, 3064, 3067
74   Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2010, Volume 74, Pages 5375, 5372, 5377
75   Earth And Planetary Science Letters, 1972, Volume 17, Pages 39-46
76   Precambrian Research, 1992, Volume 57, Pages 109
77   Precambrian Research, 1998, Volume 92, Pages 129, 136, 140

Thorium Lead Dating
78   Journal Of Petrology, 1998, Volume 39, Number 7, Pages 1292-1294
79   Journal Of Petrology, 1998, Volume 39, Number 4, Pages 729, 730
80   Journal Of Petrology, 2004, Volume 45, Number 3, Pages 556, 558, 575-576
81   Journal Of Petrology, 2007, Volume 48, Number 4, Pages 676, 677, 684
82   Journal Of Petrology, 2005, Volume 46, Number 4, Pages 830, 832-837, 843, 844, 845, 849
83   Journal Of Petrology, 1999, Volume 40, Number 9, Pages 1399, 1403, 1414, 1415

paul_nethercott@live.com.au

**207 Peacons Pocket Road
Tuchekoi, 4570, Queensland**

www.creation.com