Rocks With Future Dates

By Paul Nethercott
May 2013

Introduction

How reliable is radiometric dating? We are repeatedly told that it proves the Earth to be billions of years old. If radiometric dating is reliable than it should not contradict the evolutionary model. According to the Big Bang theory the age of the Universe is 10 to 15 billion years.[1] Standard evolutionist publications give the age of the universe as 13.75 Billion years. [2, 3]

Standard evolutionist geology views the Earth as being 4.5 billion years old. Here are some quotes from popular text: "The age of the Earth is 4.54 ± 0.05 billion years." [4] "The Solar System, formed between 4.53 and 4.58 billion years ago." [1] "The age of 4.54 billion years found for the Solar System and Earth." [1] "A valid age for the Earth of 4.55 billion years." [5, 6]

Evolutionists give the age of the galaxy as "11 to 13 billion years for the age of the Milky Way Galaxy." [1, 7] Let us remember this as we look at the following dating as given in secular science journals.

Norwegian Caledonides: An Isotopic Investigation

These rocks from Norway were dated [8] in 2009 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium method. The rock samples gave ages [9] between -31 and 76 billion years old! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed in the future? How can a rock be 60 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion?

"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." [10]

"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." [11]

Of all the samples 20 are older than the Earth, 8 are older than the Galaxy, 7 are older than the Universe and 19 have negative ages. [9] There is a 96,557 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Table 1

	Million Years	Million Years
Average	**4,123**	**2,570**
Maximum	**76,523**	**64,577**
Minimum	**-20,034**	**-31,071**

Table 2

Million Years	Million Years
-20,034	**-31,071**
-7,491	**-2,394**
-6,102	**-2,104**
-2,184	**-546**

Multi-stage Origin of Roberts Victor Eclogites

These rocks from South Africa were dated [12] in 2011 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium method. The rock samples gave ages [13] between -22 and 20 billion years old! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed 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." [13]

Table 3

Billion Years	Billion Years	Billion Years	Billion Years
-22.42	-7	-1.51	6.63
-12.34	-5.51	5.07	7.66
-11.44	-2.64	5.41	8.1
-10.02	-2.51	6.27	18.17
-9.9	-2.29	6.36	19.31
-7.15	-2.04	6.57	19.87

There is a 42,290 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Re-Os Systematics of Mantle Xenoliths

These rocks from Tanzania were dated [14] in 1999 using the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium method. The rock samples gave ages [15] between 2.7 billion years old to seven future ages! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed in the future? The author admits this in two different places:

"Corresponding to Re depletion (TRD) model ages of 2.8 Ga to the future, respectively" [15]

"Collectively, the deep samples have more radiogenic Os isotopic compositions, corresponding to TRD ages that range from 1 Ga to the future." [16]

Re/Os Isotopes of Sulfides

These rocks from eastern China were dated [17] in 2006 using the Rhenium/Osmium method. The rock samples gave ages [18] between 40 billion to -87 billion years! Since the Earth exists in the present how can rocks have formed in the future? How can a rock be 70 billion years older than the Big Bang explosion? The author admits this major problem in four different places:

"Widespread Mesozoic magmatism in the Cathaysia block may be represented by abundant mantle sulfides with mildly superchondritic187Os/188Os and 'future' model ages." [19]

"Many of the peridotites studied here contain several generations of sulfides, spanning from Archean to 'future' model ages." [20]

"Samples with higher Re/Os may give 'future' ages, or ages older than Earth." [20]

"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]

In table 4 we can see the minimum ages, and in table 5 the maximum ages. 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?

Table 4

Million Years	Million Years	Million Years
-87,817	-10,838	-3,503
-47,693	-10,501	-3,031
-27,938	-7,384	-2,902
-16,952	-6,558	-2,814
-15,940	-5,892	-2,741
-12,854	-3,773	-2,552

Table 5

Million Years	Million Years	Million Years	Million Years
6,001	6,519	9,449	20,073
6,088	6,736	10,382	22,664
6,106	7,441	10,701	24,677
6,428	8,044	10,736	34,329
6,470	8,862	18,606	39,229

There is a 127,046 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The values in table 6 are taken from figure 4 in Xisheng Xu's article. [21] There is 16 billion year difference between the oldest [9 billion years] and the youngest [-6 billion years]. If the universe is only 13 billion years old how can there be such a wide range of ages?

Table 6

	Cathaysia Block	Yangtze Block	Sino-Korean Block	Xing-Meng Block
Maximum	9,464	8,889	6,437	7,395
Minimum	-6,574	-3,752	-2,824	-2,061
Average	-75	340	440	720

Lu-Hf Geochronology

These granulite xenoliths from the Kilboume Hole, New Mexico, [22] have been dated in 1997 using the Lu-Hf isotope system. The author admits that impossible dates have been generated: "The Nd isotope model ages presented in Table 3 are generally negative for the garnet granulites. A future age, or one that is older than the actual differentiation event, represents a rotation of a sample's apparent Nd isotope evolution curve, caused by increasing the Sm/Nd ratio at some time in the past." [23]

The values in table 7 contain numerous negative ages. [24] One sample (CKH63) has dates that vary from -3,297 to 2,478 million years old. That means a 5.7 billion year difference. Earth rocks can only be 4.5 billion years old so how can there be such a wide variation?

Table 7

Million Years
-3,297
-1,051
-659
-514

Table 8

Sample	206Pb/238U	207Pb/235U	207Pb/206Pb
63a	426	611	1371
63d	317	490	1410
63e	98	161	1238
63j	430	622	1402
63g	136	242	1457
63b	319	483	1362
63c	425	624	1429

The Uranium/Lead dates [25] listed in table 8 shows that there is major discordance between various methods. Sample 63e has a 1260% difference in ages. The author's choice of 'true age' is arbitrary.

Isotopic Disequilibrium

These mineral samples from Mono Lake, California and Seram, Indonesia [26] have been dated in 1998 using the Rb/Sr and Pb/U isotope systems. These mineral samples from Mono Lake, California are supposed to be 11.9 million years old: "The HIGH glasses are all less radiogenic than the source granite at 11.9 Ma. Within the HIGH glasses there is a general positive correlation between 87Sr/86Sr (11.9 Ma) and Rb/Sr." [27] If we run the isotopic ratios [28] listed in table 2 in the article through Isoplot [29] we get dates from 3,913 to 11,500 million years old! That means they are between 328 and 966 times too old!

These mineral samples from Seram, Indonesia are supposed to be 5.5 million years old: "The most precise muscovite and biotite Ar/Ar ages obtained from the complex 5.90 Ma and 5.51 Ma, respectively." [30] If we run the isotopic ratios listed in table 4 [31] in the article through Isoplot [30] we get dates from 4,980 to 11,660 million years old! That means they are between 906 and 2,120 times too old!

"In contrast, the plagioclase from the leucosome and the three matrix samples from the melanosome of BK 21B yield 'future ages' from -11 and -15 Ma." [32] There is a 11,516 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Table 9

Table 2	Table 2	Table 4	Table 4	Table 5
206Pb/238U	207Pb/206Pb	206Pb/238U	207Pb/206Pb	87Rb/86Sr
5,902	3,914	4,493	4,982	-14.7
5,976	3,914	10,822	4,985	-13.3
6,403	3,913	9,728	4,984	-11
6,157	3,913	11,216	4,980	4.79
7,801	3,914	10,980	4,982	12
8,006	3,913	11,660	4,982	31.4
8,320	3,919	7,133	4,981	32.2
8,522	3,916	10,168	4,982	33.9
8,726	3,917	10,235	5,041	44
8,368	3,920	8,167	5,031	65.2
11,501	3,920			79

Multiple Metasomatic Events

These mineral samples from the Labait volcano, north-central Tanzania [33] have been dated in 2008 using the Rb/Sr and Sm/Nd isotope systems. The author admits that the dates give several negative ages:

"These deeper more fertile peridotites yield younger Re/Os ages (1 Ga to future ages) and represent either mixtures of ancient lithosphere with the underlying asthenosphere or recent additions to the base of the lithosphere." [34] There is a 4,205 million year spread [35] of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Table 10

Million Years
2,013
-2,192
-1,115
-573

Re–Os Evidence

These mineral samples from central eastern China, [36] have been dated in 2006 using the Re/Os 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." [37] The dating gave four impossible future ages. [38] According to Re/Os isochron diagrams [39] for Xugou peridotites, the formation is 2,000 million years old. There is a 14,230 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Central Asian Orogenic Belt

These mineral samples from north eastern China, [40] have been dated in 2010 using the Re/Os isotope systems. According to Re/Os isochron dates [41] the formation is 2,000 million years old. The author admits that the dates give several negative ages: "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." [42] There is a 23,920 million year spread [43] of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Table 11

Billion Years
-9.27
-3.83
5.91
10.62
14.65

The Mamonia Complex, Cyprus

These mineral samples from Mamonia complex, Cyprus, [44] have been dated in 2008 using the Re/Os isotope systems. According to Re/Os isochron dates [44] the formation is from three age clusters at 250 Ma, 600–800 Ma and 1,000 Ma. Four [45] of the thirty dates had future ages. This is a serious issue of having so many impossible dates:

"The minimum ages of the Mamonia spinel peridotites varies from negative (future age) to 1150 Ma." [46]

"The calculation of the ages of the melting event (depletion in Re) gives inconclusive results varying from future ages to >1000 Ma." [47]

A Paleozoic Convergent Plate

These mineral samples from Austria, [48] have been dated in 2004 using the Re/Os isotope systems. Even though the Earth is supposed to be only 4.5 billion years old some dates are twice as old: "Rhenium-Osmium model ages range between future ages and 9.1 Ga." [49] If we enter the isotopic ratios [50] into Microsoft Excel and use the standard mathematical formula [51] we find that the dates are between 100 and 2,500 percent in error.

$$t = \frac{2.303}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{(187Os/188Os) - (187Os/188Os)_0}{(187\,\mathrm{Re}/188Os)} + 1 \right)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{0.693}{h}$$

h = half life 41.6 billion years
t = the rocks age in years

Table 12

Age	T_{ch} Age	Age	Age Ratio
Million Years	Billion Years	Difference	Percentage
352	-4,300	4,652	1,221
376	-500	876	133
349	1,900	2,249	545
352	8,800	9,152	2,500
356	9,100	9,456	2,559
357	6,200	6,557	1,739
350	400	750	114
354	1,300	1,654	368
350	1,200	1,550	343
355	3,300	3,655	930
350	1,100	1,450	314
351	2,100	2,451	598
350	4,300	4,650	1,230

There is a 13,400 million year spread [50] of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Northern Canadian Cordillera Xenoliths

These mineral samples from Northern Canada, [51] have been dated in 1999 using the Re/Os isotope systems. According to Re/Os isochron dates [52] the formation's true age is 1.64 billion years old. Many of the dates were impossible future ages: "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." [52] Of the forty one dates, fifteen [37%] were negative ages. [53]

Xenoliths From Yangyuan and Fansi

These mineral samples from North China Craton, [55] have been dated in 2007 using the Re/Os isotope systems. According to Re/Os isochron dates [55] the formation's true age is 2.6 billion years old. Many of the dates were impossible future ages: "Nd model ages range from future ages to older than that of the Earth." [56] If we look at the dating table in the article, there is a 20,500 million year spread [57] of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Table 13

Billion Years	Billion Years
-10.8	-0.53
-3.5	-0.31
9.7	0.33

Formation of the North Atlantic Craton

These mineral samples from west Greenland, [58] have been dated in 2010 using the Re/Os isotope systems. According to Re/Os isochron dates [58] the formation's true age is 2.0 to 3.0 billion years old. Many of the dates were impossible future ages:

"The WG-NAC peridotites, unsurprisingly, yield a substantial number of TMa model ages that are older than the earliest solids in the solar system or Earth (16%) or result in future ages (15%). This means that a third of the samples investigated here do not provide realistic TMa mantle melting ages. Os isotope data acquired by laser ablation measurements of sulphides in peridotites typically lack precise Re/Os data, and also yield a high proportion of samples with extremely scattered and unrealistic TMa mantle melting ages that range from future ages to those exceeding the age of the Earth." [59]

"These Os isotope systematics yield equally diverse TRD model ages ranging from Paleoarchean in individual samples to future ages." [59]

There is a **21,252** million year spread of dates [60] between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The data in tables 14 and 15 correspond to tables 1 and 2 in the original article.

Table 14

Million Years
5,872
5,485
4,845
-552

Table 15

Million Years	Million Years
-14,258	5,571
-14,258	5,643
-14,209	5,793
-1,066	6,950
4,788	6,994
5,325	6,994

In Situ Measurement of Re-Os Isotopes

These mineral samples from the Siberian and Slave Cratons, and the Massif Central, France, [61] have been dated in 2010 using the Re/Os isotope systems. According to Re/Os isochron dates [62] 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)." [63]

Table 16

Billion Years	Billion Years
-1.89	-7.12
-1.3	-3.54
-1.2	-1.99
3.52	7.69
5.41	14.81

If we look at table 16 we see the bottom row has the difference between the oldest and youngest dates [64] in the original article.

Conclusion

Prominent evolutionist Brent Dalrymple states: "Several events in the formation of the Solar System can be dated with considerable precision." [65]

Looking at some of the dating it is obvious that precision is much lacking. He then goes on: "Biblical chronologies are historically important, but their credibility began to erode in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when it became apparent to some that it would be more profitable to seek a realistic age for the Earth through observation of nature than through a literal interpretation of parables." [66]

The Bible believer who accepts the creation account literally has no problem with such unreliable dating methods. Much of the data in Dalrymple's book is selectively taken to suit and ignores data to the contrary.

References

1 http://web.archive.org/web/20051223072700/http://pubs.usgs.gov/gip/geotime/age.html
The age of 10 to 15 billion years for the age of the Universe.

2 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_the_universe

3 http://arxiv.org/pdf/1001.4744v1.pdf
Microwave Anisotropy Probe Observations, Page 39, By N. Jarosik

4 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_the_Earth

5 http://sp.lyellcollection.org/content/190/1/205
The age of the Earth, G. Brent Dalrymple
Geological Society, London, Special Publications, January 1, 2001, Volume 190, Pages 205-221

6 **The age of the earth, Gérard Manhes**
Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 47, Issue 3, May 1980, Pages 370–382

7 http://arxiv.org/pdf/astro-ph/0506458v1.pdf
The age of the Galactic disk, By E. F. del Peloso and L. da Silva
Astronomy & Astrophysics, Manuscript no. 3307, February 2, 2008

Future Dates

C:\Essays\Geo_Dating\Dating\Future_Ages\Future.xlsm

8 **Norwegian Caledonides: An isotopic investigation, Lithos, Volume 117, 2010, Pages 1–19**

9 **Reference 8, Pages 6, 7**

10 **Reference 8, Pages 7**

11 **Reference 8, Pages 11**

12 **Multi-stage origin of Roberts Victor Eclogites, Lithos, Volume 142-143, 2012, Pages 161–181**

13 **Reference 12, Page 169**

14 Re-Os Systematics of Mantle Xenoliths, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, Volume 63, Number 7/8, Pages 1203–1217, 1999

15 Reference 14, Page 1206

16 Reference 14, Page 1213

17 Re/Os Isotopes of Sulfides, Lithos, Volume 102, 2008, Pages 43-64

18 Reference 17, Pages 46-50

19 Reference 17, Pages 43

20 Reference 17, Pages 52

21 Reference 17, Pages 53

22 Lu-Hf Geochronology, Chemical Geology, Volume 142, 1997, Pages 63-78

23 Reference 23, Page 73

24 Reference 23, Page 70

25 Reference 23, Page 71

26 Isotopic Disequilibrium, Chemical Geology, Volume 162, 2000, Pages 169-191

27 Reference 27, Page 175

28 Reference 27, Page 174, 175

29 http://www.bgc.org/isoplot_etc/isoplot.html

31 Reference 27, Page 177

32 Reference 27, Page 179

33 Reference 27, Page 180

34 Multiple Metasomatic Events, Lithos, Volume 112-S, 2009, Pages 896-912

35 Reference 34, Page 897

36 Reference 34, Page 910

36 Re–Os Evidence, Chemical Geology, Volume 236, 2007, Pages 323-338

37 Reference 36, Page 334

38 Reference 36, Page 331

39 Reference 36, Page 332

40 Central Asian Orogenic Belt, Lithos, Volume 126, 2011, Pages 233-247

41 Reference 40, Page 233

42 Reference 40, Page 241

43 Reference 40, Page 241, 242

44 The Mamonia Complex in Cyprus, Chemical Geology, Volume 248, 2008, Pages 195

45 Reference 44, Page 198

46 Reference 44, Page 208

47 Reference 44, Page 209

48 A Paleozoic Convergent Plate, Chemical Geology, Volume 208, 2004, Pages 141-156

49 Reference 48, Page 150

50 Reference 48, Page 146

51 Principles of Isotope Geology, Second Edition, By Gunter Faure, Published By John Wiley And Sons, New York, 1986, Page 266.

52 Northern Canadian Cordillera Xenoliths, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2000, Volume 64, Number 17, Pages 3061-3071

53 Reference 52, Page 3067

54 Reference 52, Page 3064

55 Xenoliths from Yangyuan and Fansi, Lithos, Volume 102, 2008, Page 25

56 Reference 55, Page 29

57 Reference 55, Page 37

58 Formation of the North Atlantic Craton, Chemical Geology, Volume 276, 2010, Pages 166-187

59 Reference 58, Page 181

60 Reference 58, Page 170-173

61 In situ Measurement of Re-Os Isotopes, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2002, Volume 66, Number 6, Pages 1037-1050

62 Reference 61, Page 1045

63 Reference 61, Page 1047

64 Reference 61, Page 1046

65 The Age Of The Earth, By G. Brent Dalrymple, 1991, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, Page 10.

66 Reference 53, Page 23

www.creation.com