
Impossible Radiometric Dates

Impossible Radiometric Dates

By Paul Nethercott
April 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.

Evolution Beneath the Kaapvaal Craton

These rocks from South Africa were dated⁸ in 2004 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples gave ages⁹ between -279 and 79 billion years old! There is a 358,000 million year⁹ 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.”¹⁰

“Both types of high-Fe samples have high proportions of sulfides with young to negative TRD ages.”¹¹

“Negative model ages are meaningless numbers, and are plotted at increments of .0.1 Ga to illustrate the relative abundance of sulfides.”¹¹

Table 1

Average	-5	3
Maximum	5	79
Minimum	-279	-124

Table 2

Age Type	Amount	Percent
Negative Ages	92	24.59
Older Than The Earth	35	9.35
Older Than The Galaxy	11	2.94
Older Than The Universe	8	2.13

Central Asian Orogenic Belt

These rocks from Northern China were dated¹² in 2010 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in table 2 in the article gave ages¹³ between -9 and 14 billion years old! There is a 14,450 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The rock samples in table 3 in the article gave ages¹⁴ between -3.8 and 10.6 billion years old! There is a 23,920 million 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.”¹⁵

Impossible Radiometric Dates

“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.”¹³

“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.”¹⁶

Table 3

	187Re/188Os	187Re/188Os
	Billion Years	Billion Years
Average	0.94	0.86
Maximum	2.09	10.62
Minimum	-0.33	-3.83

Table 4

	147Sm/144Nd	176Lu/177Hf
	Billion Years	Billion Years
Average	2.06	0.73
Maximum	5.91	14.65
Minimum	0.49	-9.27

If we use the Rhenium/Osmium dating formula shown in Gunter Faure's book¹⁷ and enter a set of isotopic ratios listed in the original online article¹⁸ we find the rock formation is less than 500 thousand years old.

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

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

h = half life, 41.6 billion years

t = the rocks age in years

Norwegian Caledonides

These rocks from western Norway were dated¹⁹ in 2009 using the Samarium/Neodymium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages²⁰ between -64 and 76 billion years old! There is a 141,100 million 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.”²¹

“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.”²²

“These filters eliminate most of the negative dates and leave only three apparent ages older than the Earth.”²²

Impossible Radiometric Dates

Table 5

	Million Years	Million Years
Average	4,510	1,400
Maximum	76,523	40,384
Minimum	-7,491	-64,577

Re–Os Isotopes of Sulfides

These rocks from eastern China were dated ²³ in 2007 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages ²⁴ between -47 and 39 billion years old! There is an 86,900 million 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.” ²⁵

“Many of the peridotites studied here contain several generations of sulfides, spanning from Archean to ‘future’ model ages.” ²⁵

“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.” ²⁶

“A plot of TRD model ages that includes the “future” ages required by sulfides with super chondritic 187Os/188Os shows a marked peak at -180 Ma for the samples from the Cathaysia block.” ²⁷

Table 6

	Million Years	Million Years
Average	462	1,369
Maximum	4,461	39,229
Minimum	-6,558	-47,693

Archean Man Shield, West Africa

These rocks from Sierra Leone were dated ²⁸ in 2001 using the Rhenium/Osmium and Uranium/Lead dating method. The Uranium/Lead dating system gave an average age ²⁹ of 2.5 billion years. The Rhenium/Osmium dating system gave an average age ³⁰ of 8 billion years. The rock samples in the article gave ages ³⁰ between 1.2 and 77 billion years old! There is a 76,000 million 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.” ³¹

“Five out of 13 of the low MgO samples also have Re/Os model ages older than the Earth.” ³¹

Table 7

Statistics	Re/Os	206Pb/238U	207Pb/235U	207Pb/206Pb
Average	8,092	2,367	2,649	2,910
Maximum	77,160	3,185	3,412	3,562
Minimum	1,390	1,204	1,873	2,743

Impossible Radiometric Dates

Lithospheric Mantle Evolution

These rocks from north Queensland were dated ³² in 2010 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages ³³ between -24 and 8.6 billion years old! There is a 33,330 million 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. The author admits that many ages are impossibly old or young:

“Sulfides deposited from fluids with variable Re/Os have Os-isotope compositions that either plot in the field with $\gamma_{Os} > 0$ and $Re/Os > CHUR$, and with negative TRD and TMA ages or they plot in the field with $\gamma_{Os} > 0$ and $Re/Os > CHUR$, and with negative TMA and positive TRD ages.” ³⁴

Table 8

	Billion Years	Billion Years
Average	-0.44	0.93
Maximum	8.62	3.36
Minimum	-24.71	-1.75

Upper Crust in North-East Australia

These rocks from north Queensland were dated ³⁵ in 2010 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages ³⁶ between -3.2 and 9.7 billion years old! There is a 12,950 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. Out of the 31 dates, 6 (20%) were negative and one was older than the evolutionist age of the Earth. The author admits that many ages are impossibly old or young:

“Some garnet-rich granulites from the McBride Province yielded negative Hf and Nd model ages, whereas the Mt Quincan granulite yields model ages both older than the Earth and negative; these are not useful and are rejected.” ³⁷

Table 9

Average	2.01	1.50
Maximum	9.73	3.97
Minimum	-0.80	-3.22

The Kaapvaal Cratonic Lithospheric Mantle

These rocks from South Africa were dated ³⁸ in 2006 using the Samarium/Neodymium and Lutetium/Hafnium dating methods. The rock samples in the first table [Table 10] in the article gave ages ³⁹ between -67 and 30 billion years old! There is a 97,790 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. Out of the 57 dates, 17 (30%) were negative and four were older than the evolutionist age of the Earth. The author admits that many ages are impossibly old or young:

“The large difference in Sm/Nd, but the relatively similar Nd isotope compositions of the garnet and cpx from the same sample result in generally young two-point cpx garnet Sm/Nd ‘ages’ for the Kimberley samples ranging from negative to 202 Ma.” ⁴⁰

“Evidence that complete equilibration was not achieved in many of the samples comes from the observation that tie-lines connecting the garnet and Sm/Nd data for seven samples provide ages younger than the time of kimberlite eruption, including a number of samples that give negative ages.” ⁴¹

“Negative Sm/Nd garnet ages are not uncommon for peridotite xenoliths and were first described in samples from Kimberley.” ⁴¹

Impossible Radiometric Dates

Table 10

Minimum	Maximum
-67.49	4.85
-8.15	25.46
-2	30.3

If we put the Samarium/Neodymium and Lutetium/Hafnium ratios in first table ³⁹ in the article into Microsoft Excel and use the dating formulas ^{42, 43} listed in Gunter Faure's book we find that the average age is just 100 million years! The spread of dates is not 100 billion years but just 100 million years!

$$t = \frac{2.303}{\lambda} \log \left(\frac{(143Nd / 144Nd) - (143Nd / 144Nd)_0}{(144Sm / 147Nd)} + 1 \right)$$

h = half life, 106 billion years

$$t = \frac{2.303}{\lambda} \log \left(\frac{(176Hf / 177Hf) - (176Hf / 177Hf)_0}{(176Lu / 177Hf)} + 1 \right)$$

h = half life, 37.3 billion years

Table 11

Billion Years
0.6
12.2
14.5
21.8
34.6

If we look at the dates in table eleven ⁴⁴ there is a **34,000** million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. If we look at the dates in table twelve ⁴¹ there is a **99,908** million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Table 12

Statistical	Billion Years	Billion Years
Data	Sm-Nd	Lu-Hf
Minimum	-2,247	-2,377
Maximum	96,661	1,995
Difference	98,908	4,372

In Situ Analysis of Sulphides

These rocks from South Australia and France were dated ⁴⁵ in 2001 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating methods. The rock samples in the second table in the article gave ages ⁴⁶ between -17 and 34 billion years old! With the South Australian rocks, there is a 51,000 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The author admits that many ages are impossibly old or young:

“It is obviously not the case here, given that TMA model ages for some sulphides or samples are unrealistic, giving future ages or ages older than 4.5 Ga.” ⁴⁶

“Interstitial sulphides in GRM-2 yield future TRD ages and unrealistic TMA ages, again indicating that the Os isotopic composition is not related to time-integrated in situ Re decay.” ⁴⁷

Impossible Radiometric Dates

Table 12

Billion Years	Billion Years
-17.4	4.35
-9.5	5.2
-7.06	8.3
-2.35	8.8
-0.3	34

South Australian rocks

Table 13

Billion Years	Billion Years
-32	3.11
-2.08	3.93
-1.79	6.7
-1.43	7.4
-1.42	16

French rocks

With the French rocks,⁴⁸ there is a 48,000 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

Southern African Peridotite Xenoliths

These rocks from South Africa were dated⁴⁹ in 1988 using several dating methods. If we insert the isotopic ratios listed one table⁵⁰ we find that the Rubidium/Strontium ratios give ages between 83 and between 1,100 million years old. If we insert the Lead/Lead ratios listed in the same table we find the rock is between 4,700 and 5,000 million years old. If we insert the Osmium ratios listed in another table⁵¹ and use the dating formula shown in Gunter Faure's book⁵² we find the rock is between -3,300 and 13,500 million years old. There is a **16,000** million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages.

$$t = \frac{1.04 - ({}^{187}\text{Os}/{}^{186}\text{Os})}{0.050768}$$

In the above formula, t = billions of years.

Table 14

Dating	Age	Age	Age	Age
Summary	87Rb/86Sr	187Os/186Os	Neodymium	207Pb/206Pb
Maximum	1,100	13,551	1,630	5,064
Minimum	83	-3,309	520	4,700
Difference	1,017	16,860	1,110	364

Xenoliths from Kimberley, South Africa

These rocks from South Africa were dated⁵³ in 2007 using the Rhenium/Osmium dating method. The rock samples in the article gave ages⁵⁴ between -117,980 and 143,830 million years old! With the rocks, there is a 261,810 million year spread of dates between the youngest [Negative] and the oldest [Positive] ages. The author admits that many ages are impossibly old or young:

Impossible Radiometric Dates

“The very old Re–Os model age of websterite DJ0217 of 7 Ga testifies to a more complex history for this sample.”⁵⁵

“The olivines from these samples also provide negative Re–Os model ages suggesting recent modification of their Re–Os systematics.”⁵⁶

“On a Re–Os isochron diagram, the whole-rock—olivine tie-line for DJ0259 corresponds to an age of 5.2 Ga. This unrealistic age coupled with the radiogenic Os, but near chondritic Re/Os ratio of the olivine suggests that the olivine in this dunite was either added recently, or interacted extensively with modern mantle melts, for example the host kimberlite.”⁵⁶

Table 15

Mineral	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Difference
Dunite	970	3,250	-3,470	6,720
Dunite	1,918	14,580	-15,020	29,600
Wehrlite	2,375	3,190	900	3,100
Wehrlite	3,096	21,670	-11,150	32,820
Websterite	-19,150	3,050	-117,980	121,030
Websterite	24,503	143,830	450	143,380

Conclusion

Yuri Amelin states in the journal *Elements* that radiometric dating is extremely accurate:

“However, four ²³⁸U/²³⁵U-corrected CAI dates reported recently (Amelin et al. 2010; Connelly et al. 2012) show excellent agreement, with a total range for the ages of only 0.2 million years – from 4567.18 ± 0.50 Ma to 4567.38 ± 0.31 Ma.”⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹

To come within 0.2 million years out of 4567.18 million years means an accuracy of 99.99562%. Looking at some of the dating it is obvious that precision is much lacking. The Bible believer who accepts the creation account literally has no problem with such unreliable dating methods. Much of the data in radiometric dating 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

Impossible Radiometric Dates

C:\Essays\Geo_Dating\Dating\Impossible\Impossible.xlsm

- 8 Evolution Beneath the Kaapvaal Craton, *Chemical Geology*, Volume 208, 2004, Pages 89-118
- 9 Reference 8, pages 101-105
- 10 Reference 8, pages 107
- 11 Reference 8, pages 110
- 12 Central Asian Orogenic Belt, *Lithos*, Volume 126, 2011, Pages 233-247
- 13 Reference 12, page 241
- 14 Reference 12, page 242
- 15 Reference 12, page 239
- 16 Reference 12, page 244
- 17 *Principles of Isotope Geology, Second Edition*, By Gunter Faure, Published By John Wiley And Sons, New York, 1986, Page 266.
- 18 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024493711002179>
- 19 Norwegian Caledonides: An isotopic investigation, *Lithos*, Volume 117, 2010, Pages 1-19
- 20 Reference 19, pages 6, 7
- 21 Reference 19, page 7
- 22 Reference 19, page 11
- 23 Re/Os Isotopes of Sulfides, *Lithos*, Volume 102, 2008, Pages 43-64
- 24 Reference 23, pages 46-50
- 25 Reference 23, page 52
- 26 Reference 23, page 53
- 27 Reference 23, page 61
- 28 Archean Man Shield, West Africa, *Precambrian Research*, Volume 118, 2002, Pages 267-283
- 29 Reference 28, pages 273, 274
- 30 Reference 28, page 277
- 31 Reference 28, page 276
- 32 Lithospheric Mantle Evolution, *Lithos*, Volume 125, 2011, Pages 405-422
- 33 Reference 32, page 417
- 34 Reference 32, page 415
- 35 Upper Crust in North-East Australia, *International Journal Earth Science*, 2012, Volume 101,

Impossible Radiometric Dates

Pages 1091-1109

- 36 Reference 35, Pages 1099, 1101
- 37 Reference 35, Pages 1098
- 38 The Kaapvaal Cratonic Lithospheric Mantle, *Journal Of Petrology*, 2007, Volume 48, Number 3, Pages 589-625
- 39 Reference 38, pages 600-601
- 40 Reference 38, pages 609
- 41 Reference 38, pages 612
- 42 Reference 17, pages 205
- 43 Reference 17, pages 252
- 44 Reference 38, pages 610
- 45 In Situ Analysis of Sulphides, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 2002, Volume 203, Pages 651-663
- 46 Reference 45, page 654
- 47 Reference 45, page 659
- 48 Reference 45, page 655
- 49 Southern African Peridotite Xenoliths, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 1989, Volume 53, Pages 1583-1595
- 50 Reference 49, page 1587
- 51 Reference 49, page 1588
- 52 Reference 17, page 269
- 53 Xenoliths from Kimberley, South Africa, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 2008, Volume 72, Pages 5722-5756
- 54 Reference 53, page 5737
- 55 Reference 53, page 5743
- 56 Reference 53, page 5744
- 57 Dating the Oldest Rocks in the Solar System, *Elements*, 2013, Volume 9, Pages 39-44
- 58 Amelin, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 2010, Volume 300, Pages 343-350
- 59 Connelly, *Science*, 2012, Volume 338, Pages 651-655

www.creation.com