Creation Science
Association of Orange County
P.O. Box 4325, Irvine, Calif. 92716

DEDICATED TO
FAIRNESS AND
EQUALITY IN
SCIENCE AND
EDUCATION

Creation science.

WHY THE "MILLIONS OF YEARS" CONCEPT IS WRONG
by Christopher Chui

The strength of any dating method cannot be stronger than the weakest of any assumption. The longer the date, the less probable is its validity. The first scientist who speculated 4.5 billion years for the age of the earth made more than sixty assumptions![1]

A single zircon crystal from Black Hills of South Dakota has been dated from 1.56 billion years to 2.55 billion years.[2] Rocks of known ages are always dated millions to billions of years old without exception. Modern rocks formed in 1801 near Hualalei, Hawaii have been dated to range from 160 million to three billion years![3] "Unfortunately, such checks have painted a generally gloomy picture for those seeking a chronometric tool.... Experience shows that, with the exception of results from the mineral uraninite, the three uranium-thorium-lead ages are almost always different."[4]

Moon rocks brought back by Apollo 12 have plenty of uranium 236 having a half-life of 23.9 million years. If the age of the Moon is 4.6 billion years old, uranium 236 could hardly be detectable. Apollo 15 brought back samples having excess of thorium 230 having a half-life of 80,000 years, meaning thorium 230 is primordial and not a product of uranium 238 decay. Apollo 16 brought back more striking rocks which have localized excess of radon 222 (3.8 days half-life) and excess of polonium 210 (138.3 days half-life). What this means is that both daughter components and parent components have been there since the very beginning when the rocks were formed. All dating equations are, therefore, inadequate to generate a numerical value for the age of rock samples, because unknown amounts of daughter components render the equations unsolvable for unique values.

Microprobe analysis of zircon crystal reveals that the crystal structure is tetragonal having thorium atoms located at the outer parts, uranium atoms at the opaque zones and lead atoms located at the inner part. If uranium atoms decayed into thorium and finally into lead, then these atoms must locate at the same lattice site. This shows that all these variety of atoms were there when the crystal was formed; it did not take millions of years for uranium to decay into lead.

Apollo rock samples from the Moon totally destroy the 4.5 billion years for the Moon. Datings using uranium-thorium-lead and potassium argon are always different for the same sample rock. When uranium method is applied to the same sample repeatedly, the discrepancies are alarming. Some discrepancy is larger than the so-called "age of the universe"!

Whenever extremely long half-life isotopes are not found in uranium ore mines, it spells disaster for dating systems. Uranium ore of Shinokolobwe, Katanga and that of Martin Lake in the Canadian Shield have negligible amounts of lead 204 (140 million billion years half-life) and thorium 232 (14.1 billion years half-life), but plenty of lead 208! Where did lead 208 come from without thorium? The decay equations do not apply. One suggestion is that the lead 208 came from lead 207 by neutron capture. By applying this technique, the age of the ore is reduced to thousands of years.

Isotope ratios do not yield ages but rather the different composition of isotope contents.[5] The concordant ages simply imply that they were carried over from common mantle. Ratios of lead 206 to lead 204 plotted against ratios of lead 206 to lead 207 show that rocks of any geologic epoch spread over the entire range of values, making dating systems meaningless.

The problems of radioactive dating methods are compounded by large flux of uranium into oceans by running water. Furthermore, neutron-gamma reactions are important in all lead isotope datings. In air, the observed ratio of nitrogen 14 to nitrogen 15 is equal to 269 but the same ratio in radioactive minerals is 174 ± 12, therefore, lead isotope ratios are strongly modified. Observed age differences between lead 206 to uranium 238 and lead 207 to uranium 235 are consistent with neutron-gamma transmutations on lead: 206 to lead 207 ratio. This phenomenon explains well the presence of lead 208 in mineral bodies with too little thorium and lead 204. This approach effectively reduces the billions and millions into thousands of years.

Polystrate fossils demonstrate that the millions of years concept is wrong. By means of index fossil technique, a fossil tree extends through about 275 million years! Does it mean that the tree stood there for 275 million years and eventually was buried by rocks characterized by their respective index fossils?

In fact, it can be demonstrated that the mixing model can predict all discordia curves. Further, it also predicts all isochrons. The significance of this is that all radioactive isotope datings are scientifically equivalent whether billions or millions or thousands or even a few years old! Those isotope ratios are simply mixtures of different chemicals with different half-lives and have no bearing to their true ages.

Over 100,000 radiohalos have been documented suggesting that Precambrian basement rocks were formed suddenly and not millions of years. They also give evidence that decay rates vary with time.

The variations of decay rates have been studied theoretically and experimentally. If the decay rates have varied exponentially, then 4.5 billion years half-life now was actually about 10,000 years half-life when the decay process was first started. In carbon 14 alone, its decay rate has increased over 200 years in a time span of only 20 years.

It has been calculated that what actually took 1656 years to form would take over five billion years to form using standard radiometric dating methods, showing that radiometric dating methods are essentially faulty.

It is time for geochronometers to revise their thinking. At the very least, they must not be dogmatic about their "millions of years" concept because it has been proven to be wrong.

REFERENCES:
1. C. Patterson et al., SCIENCE 121 p.69 1955
2. R.E. Zartman et al., SCIENCE 145 p. 479 1964
3. Journal of Geophysical Research 73, 7-15-68 p. 4606
4. ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA Vol 5 p. 505 1976
5. V.V. Cherdyntzov, G.I. Kisitsina, V.L. Zverev 67 "Isotopic Composition of U and Th in Rocks and Products of Active Volcanism" Geological Institute Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R. 172:178
6. Proceedings of the Second Lunar Science Conference Vol 2 pages 1117, 1494, 1496, 1499, 1516, 1539, 1620, 1631 (1971)
7. Apollo 12 Preliminary Science Report (NASA Sp-235) pp 205-208 (1970)
8. Proceedings of the Third Lunar Science Conference Vol 2, 1550 (1972)
9. Proceedings of the Fourth Lunar Science Conference Vol 2, pp 1200 and 1804 (1973)
10. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 17, 36 (1972)
11. M.A. Cook: PREHISTORY AND EARTH MODELS, Max Parrish, London 1966
12. Jager and Hunziker: LECTURES IN ISOTOPE GEOLOGY, Springer-Verlag, N.Y. (1979)
13. Gentry, R. et al. NATURE Vol 252 No. 5484, pp 564-566
14. Glasstone, S. SOURCEBOOK ON ATOMIC ENERGY, V. Nostrand 1950 pp 125-128