The Rubidium-Strontium Dating Method

By Paul Nethercott
October 2012

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]

If we run the isotopic ratios give in standard geology magazines through the computer program Isoplot [7] we find that the Uranium/Thorium/Lead isotopic ratios in the rocks disagree radically with the Rubidium/Strontium ages. The U/Th/Pb ratios give ages older than the evolutionist age of the Earth, Solar System, Galaxy and Universe. How can Earth rocks be dated as being older than the Big Bang?

If we use isotopic formulas [8-11] given in standard geology text we can arrive at ages from the Rb/Sr and Nd/Sm ratios. The formula for Rb/Sr age is given as:

$$t = \frac{2.303}{\lambda}\log\left(\frac{(87Sr/86Sr) - (87Sr/86Sr)_0}{(87Rb/86Sr)} + 1\right) \quad \textbf{[1]}$$

Where t equals the age in years. λ equals the decay constant. (87Sr/86Sr) = the current isotopic ratio. $(87Sr/86Sr)_0$ = the initial isotopic ratio. (87Rb/86Sr) = the current isotopic ratio. The same is true for the formula below.

$$t = \frac{2.303}{\lambda}\log\left(\frac{(143Nd/144Nd) - (143Nd/144Nd)_0}{(147Sm/144Nd)} + 1\right) \quad \textbf{[2]}$$

Here are examples of isotopic ratios taken from several articles in major geology magazines which give absolutely absurd dates.

Early Archaean Rocks At Fyfe Hills

These early Archaean rocks from Fyfe Hills in Antarctica were dated in 1982 by scientists form the Australian Bureau of Mineral Resources, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, and the University of Tasmania, Hobart. [12] Several isotopic samples [13] gave negative ages [-24 billion, -14 billion, -108 billion, -43 billion]. How can a rock that exists in the present and formed in the past have formed 108 billion years in the future?

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	**-3,556**
Maximum	**4,925**
Minimum	**-108,362**
Difference	**113,287**

Table 1

The Uranium/Lead ratios [14] give uniform values of 2,500 million years old. The thirty 87Rb/86Sr ratios have nineteen that give ages much older [3,039 to 4,925 Million years] and seven [1,835 to -108,362 Million years] much younger. The author's choice of age is purely arbitrary.

Shock-Melted Antarctic LL-Chondrites

These meteorite samples were dated in 1990 by scientists from the Department of Earth Sciences, Kohe University, Japan. [15] According to the article [16] the meteorite is 4.55 billion years old. The article claims that the maximum range of model ages is 3.11 to 7.33 billion years. [17] If we run the isotopic ratios through Microsoft Excel we get ages from 4 to 21 billion years old. Thirty six dates are over 5 billion years. Nine are over 10 billion years. If the Solar System is less than 5 billion years old how can the meteorite be older than the assumed age of the galaxy [10 billion years]?

87Rb/86Sr, Maximum Ages

Age Million Years	Age Million Years	Age Million Years
21,611	9,015	6,756
14,466	8,988	6,556
12,968	8,921	6,192
12,354	8,869	6,157
11,946	8,753	5,981
10,868	8,675	5,677
10,727	8,556	5,491
10,623	8,405	5,483
10,162	8,153	5,458
9,888	7,590	5,453
9,237	6,947	5,388
9,161	6,899	5,319

Table 2

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	8,585
Maximum	21,611
Minimum	3,969
Difference	17,642

Table 3

Diamonds And Mantle-Derived Xenoliths

These samples from South African diamond mines were dated in 1979 by scientist from the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. According to the isochron diagrams [17] the age of the sample is 2.4 billion years. If we run the Lead isotope ratios [18] through Isoplot we get the following values:

Lead Isotope Ages

Average	4,995
Maximum	5,249
Minimum	4,885
Std Deviation	122

Table 4

If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [18] through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	**28,429**
Maximum	**91,957**
Minimum	**3,257**
Difference	**88,700**

Table 5

There is almost a 90 billion years difference between the oldest and youngest dates. Below we can see some of the maximum ages and how stupid they are.

87Rb/86Sr, Maximum Ages

Age	Age
Million Years	Million Years
91,957	18,139
53,584	17,036
51,582	15,716
43,201	15,340
33,542	13,633
24,366	12,202

Table 6

87Rb/87Sr Isochron Of The Norton County Achondrite

This meteorite dating was done in 1967 by scientist [20] from the California Institute of Technology. In this article we will find that dating done 45 years later [2008] is giving just as absurd results. According to the Argon dating results [21] the meteorite is between 2.3 and 5.1 billion years old. If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [22] through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	**1,375**
Maximum	**4,871**
Minimum	**-16,277**
Difference	**21,149**

Table 7

Base and Precious Metal Veins

According to the article the dating [Coeur D'Alene Mining District, Idaho] was done in 2002 by scientists from the U.S. Geological Survey, California, the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Washington University, Saint Louis, Missouri, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California and the Sunshine Precious Metals Company, Idaho. [22] If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [23] from Table 1 in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	**128,708**
Maximum	**508,074**
Minimum	**7,990**
Difference	**516,064**

Table 8

There is a 500 billion year difference between the youngest and oldest dates. The average age is over 120 billion years. Below we can see some of the maximum ages and how stupid they are.

87Rb/86Sr, Maximum Ages

Age Million Years	Age Million Years	Age Million Years	Age Million Years
508,074	157,304	125,399	86,483
314,336	151,142	114,796	75,684
302,580	150,089	114,795	72,915
287,077	149,802	113,950	71,225
207,257	144,826	111,884	69,729
201,185	142,977	110,719	63,934
191,104	138,115	109,164	63,406
190,573	134,866	108,617	61,740
189,167	134,061	108,278	56,735
186,066	134,039	102,140	52,117
183,607	132,885	99,952	47,926
183,225	132,746	93,848	46,968
163,764	131,670	89,246	39,944
158,436	130,664	88,626	37,623
158,282	129,495	87,708	16,153

Table 9

If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [24] from Table 2 in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	139,471
Maximum	508,074
Minimum	12,314
Difference	520,388

Table 10

There is a 520 billion year difference between the youngest and oldest dates. The average age is almost 140 billion years. Below we can see some of the maximum ages and how stupid they are. The oldest dates is over half a trillion years old.

87Rb/86Sr, Maximum Ages

Age Million Years	Age Million Years	Age Million Years
508,074	147,429	87,708
314,336	138,882	84,716
165,542	118,679	82,294
157,714	98,450	59,080
157,589	91,450	45,663
151,317	89,236	12,314

Table 11

If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [25] from Table 4 in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	**88,571**
Maximum	**288,775**
Minimum	**-170,232**
Difference	**459,007**

Table 12

There is a 560 billion year difference between the youngest and oldest dates. The average age is almost 90 billion years. Below we can see some of the maximum ages and how stupid they are. The oldest date is almost 300 billion years old. The youngest is negative 170 billion years old.

87Rb/86Sr, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age	Age	Age
Million Years	Million Years	Million Years	Million Years	Million Years	Million Years
288,775	97,242	94,819	93,079	90,891	85,924
102,716	97,117	94,465	92,995	90,700	85,805
101,380	97,033	94,453	92,972	90,536	85,263
100,277	96,792	94,431	92,967	90,367	84,990
99,779	96,687	94,408	92,963	90,127	83,914
99,683	96,655	94,397	92,915	90,089	83,584
99,369	96,602	94,345	92,878	90,018	82,639
99,238	96,293	94,339	92,863	89,838	80,962
99,177	96,252	94,249	92,829	89,736	80,214
98,948	96,236	94,235	92,634	89,466	79,082
98,765	96,043	94,139	92,630	89,236	78,053
98,736	95,981	94,100	92,374	89,171	76,750
98,685	95,894	93,928	92,315	88,932	76,256
98,591	95,761	93,841	92,309	88,876	76,178
98,436	95,711	93,766	92,205	88,540	75,048
98,285	95,609	93,730	92,140	88,295	72,004
98,243	95,522	93,582	92,108	87,585	70,479
97,979	95,510	93,574	91,906	87,359	69,790
97,830	95,388	93,504	91,674	87,260	55,157
97,628	95,218	93,401	91,650	86,826	53,568
97,604	95,197	93,394	91,435	86,691	51,934
97,545	95,185	93,271	91,238	86,474	-39,207
97,421	95,125	93,199	91,189	86,136	-89,656
97,402	94,994	93,124	91,005	86,050	-170,232

Table 13

The Munchberg Massif, Southern Germany

According the article, this dating was done in 1990 by scientists from the Koln University, Germany and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, California. [26] There is an 8 billion year difference between the youngest and oldest dates.

87Rb/86Sr, Ages Dating Summary

Average	**1,105**
Maximum	**7,834**
Minimum	**-296**
Difference	**8,130**

Table 14

Rocks of the Central Wyoming Province

These rock samples were dated in 2005 by scientists from the University of Wyoming. [27] If we run the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium isotope ratios [28] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

Ages Dating Summary

Dating Summary	Age 87Rb/86Sr	Age 147Sm/144Nd	Age 207Pb/206Pb	Age 208Pb/232Th	Age 206Pb/238U
Average	**2,863**	**2,869**	**5,123**	**17,899**	**11,906**
Maximum	**2,952**	**2,954**	**5,294**	**38,746**	**18,985**
Minimum	**2,630**	**2,631**	**4,662**	**6,650**	**7,294**
Std Deviation	**38**	**39**	**152**	**9,754**	**3,298**

Table 15

The Uranium/Lead dates [29] are up to sixteen billion years older than the Rubidium/Strontium and Neodymium/Samarium dates. The Thorium/Lead dates are up to thirty six billion years older. The so called true age is just a guess.

Basalts From Apollo 15

According the article, this Moon rock dating was done in 1972 by scientists from the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California. [30] According to the essay the rock is 3.4 billion years old. 31 If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [32] from Table 4 in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	**3,045**
Maximum	**27,211**
Minimum	**-3,808**
Difference	**31,019**

Table 16

Of the 21 isotopic ratios, seven were below 500 million years old. Two were over six billion years old.

History Of The Pasamonte Achondrite

According to the article this meteorite specimen was dated in 1977 by scientists from the United States Geological Survey, Colorado and the Department of Chemistry and Geochemistry, Colorado School of Mines. [33] The article states that Rubidium/Strontium dating affirms that this material is 4.5 billion years old. [34] If we run the various isotope ratios [34] from two different tables in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

U/Th/Pb Age Dating Summary

Summary	206Pb/238U	207Pb/235U	207Pb/206Pb	208Pb/232Th
Average	3,088	3,666	4,566	2,263
Maximum	5,694	5,032	4,963	14,800
Minimum	103	865	4,440	-10,700
Difference	5,591	4,167	523	25,500

Table 17

If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [34] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	4,403
Maximum	6,674
Minimum	2,412
Difference	4,262

Table 18

The Thorium/Lead dates are up to twelve billion years older. The so called true age is just a guess.

Sr Isotopic Composition Of Afar Volcanics

According to the article [35] this specimen [basalts from the Afar depression in Ethiopia] was dated in 1977 by scientists from Italy and France. The article states that the formation is of the late Quaternary period and thus very young. If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [36] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	183
Maximum	2,260
Minimum	-108
Difference	2,368

Table 19

As far as the rocks being of a Quaternary age, the dates just don't line up.

Orogenic Lherzolite Complexes

According to the article [37] this specimen from Gibraltar was dated in 1979 by scientists from France. According to the article [38] the maximum age of the samples is 103 million years. If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [39] from the two different tables in the article [Tables 2 and 3] through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Summary	Table 2	Table 3
Average	-52,203	-29,099
Maximum	-2,229	-1,258
Minimum	-135,140	-102,498
Difference	132,911	101,240

Table 20

The dates are light years different from what the essay claims. They are just absurd.

Isotopic Geochemistry (Os, Sr, Pb)

According to the article [40] this specimen [the Golda Zuelva and Mboutou anorogenic complexes, North Cameroun] was dated in 1982 by scientists from France. According to the article [40] the maximum age of the sample is 66 million years. If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [41] from the two different tables in the article [Tables 1and 2] through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Dating Summary	87Rb/86Sr Age	87Rb/86Sr Age	Pb207/Pb206 Age
Average	321	57	4,982
Maximum	1,635	141	5,080
Minimum	52	0	4,932
Difference	1,687	141	10,012

Table 21

If we run the 207Pb/206Pb isotope ratios [42] from the article [Table 3] through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Lead Isotope Ages

Age	Age
5,080	4,964
5,048	4,958
4,990	4,957
4,984	4,938
4,980	4,932
4,975	

Table 22

The so called true age is just a guess.

Cretaceous-Tertiary Boundary Sediments

According to the article [43] this specimen [from the Barranco del Gredero, Caravaca, Spain] was dated in 1983 by scientists from University of California, Los Angeles, the United States Geological Survey, and the Geological Institute, University of Amsterdam. According to the article [44] the maximum age of the sample is 65 million years. If we run the 87Rb/86Sr isotope ratios [44] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	740
Maximum	5,157
Minimum	-266
Difference	5,423

Table 23

Out of the 16 dates derived from isotopic ratios, ten were over 100 million years old. Two were over 4 billion years old. One was negative 266 million years old. How can a rock that formed in the past have a negative age! The choice of 65 million years is just a guess.

Correlated N D, Sr And Pb Isotope Variation

According to the article [45] this specimen [Walvis Ridge, Walvis Bay] was dated in 1982 by scientists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Department of Geochemistry, University of Cape Town, South Africa. According to the article [45] the age of the sample is 70 million years. If we run the various isotope ratios [46] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Summary	Pb207/Pb206	147Sm/144Nd	87Rb/86Sr
Average	5,033	70	64
Maximum	5,061	70	93
Minimum	5,004	69	0
Difference	57	140	93

Table 24

A Depleted Mantle Source For Kimberlites

According to the article [47] this specimen [kimberlites from Zaire] was dated in 1984 by scientists from Belgium. According to the article [48] the age of the samples is 70 million years. If we run the various isotope ratios [49] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Summary	207Pb/206Pb	206Pb/238U	87Rb/86Sr	147Sm/144Nd
Average	4,977	4,810	86	72
Maximum	5,017	10,870	146	80
Minimum	4,909	1,391	50	63
Difference	108	9,478	196	17

Table 25

The 207Pb/206Pb maximum age is 34 times older than the 87Rb/86Sr maximum age. The 206Pb/238U maximum age is 74 times older than the 147Sm/144Nd maximum age. There is a 10.8 billion year difference between the oldest and youngest age attained.

Sm-Nd Isotopic Systematics

According to the article [50] this specimen [Enderby Land, East Antarctic] was dated in 1984 by scientists from the Australian National University, Canberra, and the Bureau of Mineral Resources, Canberra. According to the article [50] the age of the sample is 3,000 million years. If we run the Rb/Sr isotope ratios [51] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	-873
Maximum	3,484
Minimum	-25,121
Difference	28,605

Table 26

There is almost a 30 billion year difference between the oldest and youngest dates.

Strontium, Neodymium And Lead Compositions

According to the article [52] this specimen [Snake River Plain, Idaho] was dated in 1985 by scientists from the Geology Department, Rice University, Houston, Texas, the Earth Sciences Department, Open University, England and the Geology Department, Ricks College, Idaho. According to the article [52] the age of the sample is 3.4 billion years. If we run the various isotope ratios [53] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Summary	Pb207/Pb206	Pb207/Pb206	87Rb/86Sr
Average	5,143	5,138	40,052
Maximum	5,362	5,314	205,093
Minimum	4,698	4,940	1,443
Difference	664	374	203,650

Table 27

The Lead isotope ratios from two different tables give dates 200 billion years younger than the Rb/Sr isotope ratios. The Average age of the Rb/Sr isotope ratios is 40 billion years. Below we can see some of the maximum ages and how stupid they are.

87Rb/86Sr, Maximum Ages

Age Million Years	Age Million Years
205,093	11,974
189,521	11,908
188,777	9,960
95,450	9,101
52,643	7,124
13,119	6,022
12,220	5,089

Table 28

Trace Element And Sr And Nd Isotope

According to the article [54] this specimen [West Germany] was dated in 1986 by scientists from Germany and California. According to the article [54] the age of the samples is 2 billion years. If we run the various isotope ratios [55] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	41,573
Maximum	175,289
Minimum	-30,734
Difference	206,022

Table 29

Many of the Rb/Sr isotopic ratios would not produce proper ages. Those that did gave absurd values. Below are some dates taken from another table [56] in the original article.

Rb/Sr and Sm/Nd Age Dating Summary

TABLE 5	Sm-Nd	Rb-Sr
Sample	Age	Age
Ib/K1	2,090	2,210
Ib/8	2,900	1,790
D1	1,450	1,660
Ib/5	1,100	1,430
D45	1,630	530
D58	3,200	1,930

Table 30

The Southeast Australian Lithosphere Mantle

According to the article [57] this specimen was dated in 1987 by scientists from The Australian National University. According to the article [58] the age of the samples is 1.5 billion years. If we run the various isotope ratios [59] from two different tables in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	1,905	42,639
Maximum	11,657	218,042
Minimum	134	-15,716
Difference	11,523	233,758

Table 31

Below we can see the maximum ages obtained from the second table. The oldest age is 18 times older than the Big Bang explosion. It is sixty two times older than the so called age of the Earth.

87Rb/86Sr, Maximum Ages

Age	Age
218,042	45,207
64,770	38,581
54,457	26,113
48,074	17,246
45,734	11,813

Table 32

Strontium, Neodymium and Lead Isotopic

According to the article [60] this specimen was dated in 1988 by scientists from the Department of Terrestrial Magnetism. Carnegie Institution of Washington. Throughout the article the author admits that the dates are contradicting and unreliable: “For sample 7541. the apatite eclogite, the range observed in both Rh/Sr and Sm/Nd for the whole-rock and mineral separates is quite small resulting in very imprecise "ages" of 400 Ma for Rb-Sr and 1110 Ma for Sm-Nd.” [61] If we run the Lead isotope ratios [62] from the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Pb 207/206 Age Dating Summary

Age	Age
4,933	4,928
4,961	4,956
4,952	4,947
4,952	4,957
4,942	4,927
4,978	4,952
4,940	4,954
4,947	

Table 33

Sr, Nd, and Os Isotope Geochemistry

According to the article [63] this specimen [Camp Creek area, Arizona] was dated in 1987 by scientists from The University of Tennessee, the University of Michigan, the University of California, Leeds University, and the University of Chicago. According to the article [64] the age of the samples is 120 million years. If we run the various isotope ratios [65] from two different tables in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr and Sm/Nd Age Dating Summary

Summary	87Rb/86Sr	87Rb/86Sr	147Sm/144Nd	147Sm/144Nd
Average	310	103	120	159
Maximum	1,092	207	123	400
Minimum	0	0	120	119
Difference	1,092	207	3	281

Table 34

The author's choice of 120 million years is just a guess.

Pb, Nd and Sr Isotopic Geochemistry

According to the article [66] this specimen [Bellsbank kimberlite, South Africa] was dated in 1991 by scientists from the University Of Rochester, New York, Guiyang University in China, and the United States Geological Survey, Colorado. According to the article [67] the age of the samples is just 1 million years. If we run the various isotope ratios [68] from two different tables in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table	207Pb/206Pb	206Pb/238U	208Pb/232Th	87Rb/86Sr
Summaries	Age	Age	Age	Age
Average	5,057	5,092	10,182	-1,502
Maximum	5,120	8,584	17,171	0
Minimum	5,002	0	0	-3,593
Difference	118	8,584	17,171	3,593

Table 35

In tables 36 to 39 we can see some of the astounding spread of dates [million of years]. The oldest date is over 17 billion years old. The youngest is less than negative 3.5 billion years. The difference between the two is over 20 billion years. According to the article the true age of the rock is just one million years old!

208Pb/232Th, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
17,171	13,322	9,737	7,968
15,343	13,202	9,707	7,830
15,299	13,001	9,049	7,250
15,136	11,119	8,420	6,972
15,054	10,873	8,419	6,628
13,476	10,758	8,368	6,577

Table 36

206Pb/238U, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age
8,584	6,656	5,576
7,975	6,654	5,520
7,314	6,518	5,285
7,184	6,448	5,159
6,861	5,758	5,099

Table 37

Pb 207/206, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
5,120	5,067	5,060	5,049
5,109	5,066	5,059	5,045
5,097	5,066	5,051	5,044
5,077	5,065	5,050	5,044
5,067	5,062	5,050	5,033
5,067	5,060	5,050	5,022

Table 38

87Rb/86Sr, Minimum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
-3,593	-2,981	-1,917	-1,323
-3,231	-2,725	-1,611	-1,245
-3,089	-2,050	-1,499	-1,229
-3,067	-1,926	-1,370	-1,194

Table 39

Sr, Nd, and Pb isotopes

According to the article [68] this specimen [eastern China] was dated in 1992 by scientists from the University Of Rochester, New York, Guiyang University in China, and the United States Geological Survey, Colorado. According to the article: "Observed high Th/U, Rb/Sr, 87Sr/86 Sr and Delta 208, low Sm/Nd ratios, and a large negative Nd in phlogopite pyroxenite with a depleted mantle model age of 2.9 Ga, support our contention that metasomatized continental lower mantle lithosphere is the source for the EMI component." [68] If we run the various isotope ratios [69] from two different tables in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Dating	232Th/208Pb	206Pb/238U	207Pb/206Pb
Summaries	Age	Age	Age
Average	14,198	7,366	5,014
Maximum	94,396	22,201	5,077
Minimum	79	1,117	4,945
Difference	94,317	21,083	131

Table 40

If the true age is 2.9 billion years why so much discordance? In tables 41 to 43 we can see some of the astounding spread of dates [million of years]. The oldest date is over 94 billion years old. The youngest is 79 million years. The difference between the two is over 94 billion years. The oldest date is 1,194 times older than the youngest. According to the article the true age of the rock is 2.9 billion years old!

208Pb/232Th, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
94,396	39,267	10,595	8,171
90,683	26,266	10,284	7,789
74,639	18,334	9,328	7,638
58,153	16,357	8,821	7,375
55,324	14,250	8,771	7,317
45,242	11,215	8,403	5,759

Table 41

206Pb/238U, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
22,201	9,878	7,348	5,746
21,813	9,656	7,335	5,700
19,320	9,054	7,249	5,218
16,656	8,242	7,202	5,201
16,200	8,044	7,019	5,163
14,748	7,996	6,923	5,159
13,607	7,590	6,848	5,099
11,256	7,422	6,292	4,812

Table 42

Production of Jurassic Rhyolite

According to the article [70] this specimen [Patagonia, South America] was dated in 1994 by scientists from the British Antarctic Survey, National University, Argentina. According to the article: "Primary magmas of andesitic composition were generated by partial melting of mafic" Grenvillian" lower crust, indentified by depleted-mantle model ages of 1150-1600 Ma." [70] If we run the various isotope ratios [71] from two different tables in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	432
Maximum	17,387
Minimum	-4,633
Difference	22,020

Table 43

Evolution of Reunion Hotspot Mantle

According to the article [72] this specimen [Reunion and Mauritius Islands] was dated in 1995 by scientists from the University of Hawaii. According to the article: "Whole-rock powder obtained from P. Krishnamurthy. (87Sr/86 Sr), and em(T) are age-corrected values; *T* = 66 Ma for the drill hole lavas." [73] If we run the various isotope ratios [74] from two different tables in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table	232Th/208Pb	206Pb/238U	207Pb/206Pb
Summaries	Age	Age	Age
Average	8,079	4,449	4,976
Maximum	13,287	6,285	5,016
Minimum	5,641	3,010	4,953
Difference	7,646	3,276	63

Table 44

208Pb/232Th, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
13,287	8,725	7,363	6,540
11,832	8,609	7,362	6,479
11,017	7,541	7,080	6,323
10,357	7,517	7,017	5,660
9,101	7,446	6,679	5,641

Table 45

206Pb/238U, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
6,285	4,903	4,141	3,875
6,165	4,633	4,133	3,647
5,767	4,342	4,011	3,548
5,553	4,258	4,001	3,369
5,152	4,220	3,973	3,010

Table 46

According to dating charts in the article, the true age is just 66 million years old! [74]

An Extremely Low U/Pb Source

According to the article [75] this specimen [lunar meteorite] was dated in 1993 by scientists from the United States Geological Survey, Colorado, the United States Geological Survey, California and The National Institute of Polar Research, Tokyo. According to the article: "The Pb-Pb internal isochron obtained for acid leached residues of separated mineral fractions yields an age of 3940 ± 28 Ma, which is similar to the U-Pb (3850 ± 150 Ma) and Th-Pb (3820 ± 290 Ma) internal isochron ages. The Sm-Nd data for the mineral separates yield an internal isochron age of 3871 ± 57 Ma and an initial 143Nd/I44Nd value of 0.50797 ± 10. The Rb-Sr data yield an internal isochron age of 3840 ± 32 Ma." [75]

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	3,619
Maximum	5,385
Minimum	721
Difference	4,664

Table 47

Uranium Age Dating Summary

Table	207Pb/206Pb	206Pb/238U	208Pb/232Th	207Pb/235U
Summaries	Age	Age	Age	Age
Average	4,673	8,035	10,148	4,546
Maximum	5,018	56,923	65,286	8,128
Minimum	3,961	1,477	2,542	2,784
Difference	1,057	55,445	62,744	5,344

Table 48

The article claims that the Rb/Sr age is 3.8 billion years for this meteorite. If that is the true age why are all the Uranium/Thorium/Lead dates [76] so stupid? Or are they right and the Rb/Sr is wrong?

208Pb/232Th, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
65,286	14,430	9,094	5,401
33,898	14,410	6,520	5,396
25,013	13,107	6,166	5,365
22,178	12,738	6,121	5,098
21,204	11,641	5,671	5,035
17,611	11,174	5,408	4,678

Table 49

206Pb/238U, Maximum Ages

Age	Age	Age	Age
56,923	10,895	6,764	5,777
27,313	10,278	6,670	5,625
17,873	9,653	6,449	5,602
13,680	8,009	6,436	5,278
13,623	7,395	6,070	5,147

Table 50

The 72 Ma Geochemical Evolution

According to the article [77] this specimen [Madeira Archipelago] was dated in 2000 by scientists from Germany. The average Lead date is 705 times older than the average Rubidium date. The true age is claimed to be 430 million years old. [77] If we run the various isotope ratios [78] from two different tables in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table	207Pb/206Pb	87Rb/86Sr	147Sm/144Nd
Summaries	Age	Age	Age
Average	4,938	7	10
Maximum	5,199	55	164
Minimum	4,898	-4	0
Difference	302	59	164

Table 51

If the true age is 430 million years than none of the dating methods are even vaguely close. The oldest date is 731 times older than the youngest.

The Himalayan Collision Zone

According to the article [79] this specimen [East Tibet] was dated in 2000 by scientists from Germany. As far as the age goes the author states: "Partial melting of the mantle source was most likely triggered by a Cenozoic asthenospheric mantle diapir related to Indian–Asian continent collision at 65–45Ma. Rising and emplacement of carbonatitic magmas with coeval potassium-rich magmas took place in the tectonic regime of the transition from transpression to transtension at Eocene/Oligocene boundary in the EIACZ." [80] He also states: "The initial "Nd values and 87Sr / 86Sr ratios were calculated at *t*=35Ma." [81] If we run the various isotope ratios [82] from two different tables in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Pb 207/206, Dating Summary

Dating	207Pb/206Pb	87Rb/86Sr
Summary	Age	Age
Average	5,015	0
Maximum	5,023	0
Minimum	4,976	0
Difference	47	0

Table 52

If the specimen is of the Eocene era [Less than 100 million years old] how can the Lead/Lead dating produce such rubbish? If we run the Rb/Sr ratios through Microsoft Excel we get zero ages!

Evidence for a Non Magmatic component

According to the article [83] this specimen [Yukon, Canada] was dated in 2001 by Canadian scientists from the University of Alberta, and Dalhousie University, Halifax. According to Argon dating the age of the material is 70 million years. [84] If we run the various isotope ratios [85] from two different tables in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table	207Pb/206Pb	87Rb/86Sr
Summaries	Age	Age
Average	4,955	71
Maximum	5,214	101
Minimum	4,918	60
Difference	296	41

Table 53

If we look at the average ages we see that there is a 7 thousand percent difference between them! If we compare the youngest and oldest dates we see that there is an 8,540 percent difference between them.

The Origin Of Geochemical Diversity

According to the article [86] this specimen [lunar basalt] was dated in 2007 by scientists from New Mexico University. According to Rb/Sr isochron diagram the age of the material is 3.678 billion years. [87] If we run the various isotope ratios [88] from two different tables in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table	207Pb/206Pb	206Pb/238U	87Rb/86Sr
Summaries	Age	Age	Age
Average	4,635	6,565	4,672
Maximum	5,111	18,213	7,094
Minimum	4,028	3,706	3,476
Difference	1,082	14,506	3,618

Table 54

The dating methods all disagree with each other. There is a wide spread of dates which are just random.

Mechanisms For Incompatible-Element Enrichment

According to the article [89] this specimen [meteorite Northwest Africa] was dated in 2009 by scientists from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, University of New Mexico, the University of California, Berkeley, and Arizona State University. The author states: "Rubidium–Strontium isotopic analyses yield an age of 2,947 ± 16 Ma" If we run the various isotope ratios [90] from a table in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	**5,483**
Maximum	**13,497**
Minimum	**1,917**
Difference	**11,579**

Table 55

Out of the eleven isotope ratios, two returned dates over ten billion years old.

Constraints On Martian Differentiation Processes

According to the article [91] this specimen [Martian meteorite] was dated in 1997 by scientists from the NASA Johnson Space Centre, Houston, Texas, the University of Tennessee, and Lockheed Martin, Houston, Texas. According to the article [91] the age range is: "The neodymium isotopic systematics of QUE 94201 are not consistent with significant melting between 4.525 Ga and 327 Ma." If we run the various isotope ratios [92] from two different tables [1 and 4] in the article through Microsoft Excel we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Summary	Table 1	Table 4
Average	**618**	**-34,834**
Maximum	**1,765**	**4,642**
Minimum	**-98**	**-118,922**
Difference	**1,668**	**123,564**

Table 56

Instead of having a 4.2 billion year spread we have a 123 billion year spread of dates. Both tables in the article give dates way off the so called true age.

Geochemistry of the Volcan de l'Androy

According to the article [93] this specimen from the Androy massif in south eastern Madagascar was dated in 2008 by scientists from the University Of Hawaii. According to the article Argon and Rubidium dating defined the so called true ages as: "The R2 rhyolites define a whole-rock Rb/Sr isochron of 84 Ma, the same, within error, as an 40Ar/39Ar sanidine age reported by earlier workers." [93] If we run the various isotope ratios [94] from a table in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Pb 207/206, Dating Summary

Average	**5,004**	**4,999**
Maximum	**5,048**	**5,029**
Minimum	**4,980**	**4,984**
Difference	**67**	**18**

Table 57

The Lead dating give ages that are sixty times older than the Rb/Sr dates.

Continental Lithospheric Contribution

According to the article [95] this specimen from southern Portugal was dated in 1997 by scientists from France. According to the article Argon and Rubidium dating defined the so called true ages as: "The age of the intrusion and crystallization of the alkaline rocks of the Serra de Monchique is 72 Ma, based on Rb/Sr and K/Ar dating." [96] If we run the various isotope ratios [97] from a table in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table	207Pb/206Pb	208Pb/232Th	206Pb/238U	87Rb/86Sr
Summaries	Age	Age	Age	Age
Average	4,920	6,126	4,539	-62
Maximum	4,949	10,084	7,723	-50
Minimum	4,894	2,616	2,306	-75
Difference	55	7,467	5,417	25

Table 58

The date of 72 million years is just a guess. The Thorium/Lead method gives dates 140 times older. The Uranium/Lead methods give dates 107 times older. Below we can see the maximum ages [million years] calculated form isotope ratios. Compare these with the so called true age!

Maximum Ages

208Pb/232Th	206Pb/238U
10,084	7,723
9,320	7,060
8,101	6,507
7,502	6,387
7,080	6,206
6,891	5,143
6,655	4,734
6,313	4,186
5,830	3,768
5,755	3,761
5,029	3,487

Table 59

Garnet Granulite Xenoliths

According to the article [98] this specimen from the northern Baltic shield was dated in 2001 by scientists from England, USA and Russia. According to the article Argon dating defined the so called true ages as 400 to 2200 million years. [99] If we run the various isotope ratios [100] from table 4 in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table	206Pb/238U	207Pb/206Pb
Summaries	Age	Age
Average	17,002	5,046
Maximum	40,059	5,295
Minimum	1,608	3,908
Difference	38,452	1,387

Table 60

Below are the maximum ages calculated from isotope ratios in tables 4 and 5 in the article:

206Pb/238U, Maximum Ages

206Pb/238U Age	206Pb/238U Age	206Pb/238U Age	206Pb/238U Age
40,059	28,118	21,092	13,724
35,742	27,127	16,026	13,404
34,459	25,884	14,371	12,747
33,978	21,209	14,272	10,956

Table 61

206Pb/238U, Maximum Ages

206Pb/238U Age	206Pb/238U Age	206Pb/238U Age
20,648	13,724	10,956
17,527	13,404	10,049
16,336	12,622	6,792
15,626	12,165	6,265
15,018	11,432	5,865

Table 62

If we run more ratios form and online supplement we get ages uniformly 5 billion years old. Compare these with the so called true age!

The Isotope and Trace Element Budget

According to the article [102] this specimen from the Devil River Arc System, New Zealand was dated in 2000 by scientists from Germany. According to the article, the so called true ages is Cambrian. [102] If we run the various isotope ratios [103] from table 4 in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Age Dating Summary

Table Summaries	207Pb/206Pb Age	206Pb/238U Age	87Rb/86Sr Age
Average	4,970	19,143	500
Maximum	4,986	21,761	501
Minimum	4,932	15,150	495
Difference	54	6,611	6

Table 63

The Lead/Lead dates are ten times too old and the Uranium/Lead dates are 40 times too old!

Fluid Flow and Diffusion

According to the article [104] this specimen from the Waterville Formation in south–central Maine, USA, was dated in 1997 by scientists from England and USA. According to the article, the so called true age is: "the 376±6 Ma Rb–Sr whole-rock age of the syn-metamorphic Hallowell pluton." [104] According to isochron diagrams in the article [105] the model age is between 342 to 391 million years. The article has an age range diagram [106] which claims that the maximum age is 425 million years. If we run the various isotope ratios [107] from table 4 in the article through Isoplot we get the following values respectively:

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	**746**
Maximum	**2,063**
Minimum	**316**
Difference	**1,747**

Table 64

Out of the 150 isotopic ratios in the essay, 134 gave ages greater than the so called maximum age limit. Twenty six gave ages that were more than twice the maximum limit.

Temporal Evolution of the Lithospheric Mantle

According to the article [108] this specimen from the Eastern North China Craton was dated in 2009 by scientists from China, USA and Australia. Various tables [109] in the essay have either calculated dates or ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at strong disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates over a 32 billion year range.

Age Dating Summary

Table	147Sm/144Nd	176Lu/176Hf	187Re/188Os	87Rb/86Sr
Summaries	**Age**	**Age**	**Age**	**Age**
Average	**291**	**-220**	**1,048**	**9**
Maximum	**3,079**	**4,192**	**20,710**	**22**
Minimum	**-3,742**	**-9,369**	**-11,060**	**0**
Difference	**6,821**	**13,561**	**31,770**	**22**

Table 65

Petrogenesis and Origins of Mid-Cretaceous

According to the article [110] this specimen from the Intraplate Volcanism in Marlborough, New Zealand was dated in 2010 by scientists from New Zealand. According to the essay: “the intraplate basalts in New Zealand that have been erupted intermittently over the last c. 100 Myr” [111] Various tables [112] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at strong disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates over a 10 billion year range. None of the Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to a Cretaceous age.

Age Dating Summary

Table	207Pb/206Pb	207Pb/235U	87Rb/86Sr	208Pb/232Th	206Pb/238U
Summaries	**Age**	**Age**	**Age**	**Age**	**Age**
Average	**4,876**	**4,416**	**59**	**6,333**	**3,515**
Maximum	**4,945**	**5,159**	**85**	**10,716**	**5,717**
Minimum	**4,836**	**4,088**	**15**	**4,785**	**2,712**
Difference	**109**	**1,071**	**70**	**5,931**	**3,005**

Table 66

The Petrogenetic Association of Carbonatite

According to the article [113] this specimen from the Spitskop Complex, South Africa was dated in 1999 by scientists from South Africa. According to the essay: "The 1,341 Ma old Spitskop Complex in South Africa is one of a series of intrusions of alkaline affinity." [113] Various tables [114] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at strong disagreement with each other.

Age Dating Summary

Dating	87Rb/86Sr	207Pb/206Pb
Summary	Age	Age
Average	-6,012	5,056
Maximum	2,762	5,126
Minimum	-66,499	4,649
Difference	69,262	477

Table 67

Nine of the twenty six Rb/Sr dates are over three billion years in error. Seven are over eleven billion years in error. The thirteen Lead 206/207 dates are all totally way off.

Geochemistry Of The Jurassic Oceanic Crust

According to the article [115] this specimen from the Canary Islands was dated in 1998 by scientists from Germany. According to the essay: "An Sm–Nd isochron gives an age of 178 ± 17 Ma, which agrees with the age predicted from paleomagnetic data."[115] The article places the age in the late Cretaceous period. Various tables [116] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at strong disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates over a 350 billion year range! None of the Lead or Rubidium based dating methods even come vaguely close to a Jurassic age.

Age Dating Summary

Dating	87Rb/86Sr	207Pb/206Pb
Summary	Age	Age
Average	-149,488	4,974
Maximum	51,967	5,024
Minimum	-299,346	4,845
Difference	351,313	179

Table 68

The Age Of Dar Al Gani 476

According to the article [117] this Martian meteorite was dated in 2003 by scientists from the University of New Mexico, NASA Johnson Space Centre, Lockheed Engineering and Science Company. According to the essay: “In either case, the fact that the Martian meteorites define a whole rock Rb-Sr isochron with an age of 4.5 Ga require these reservoirs to have formed near the time of planet formation." [117] A table [118] in the essay has isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at strong disagreement with the assumed age. There is a spread of dates of almost 18 billion year range! None of the Rubidium based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age.

Rb/Sr Age Dating Summary

Average	-9,398
Maximum	-2,142
Minimum	-20,004
Difference	17,862

Table 69

Petrogenesis Of The Flood Basalts

According to the article [119] this basalt form the Northern Kerguelen Archipelago was dated in 1998 by scientists from the Massachusetts Institute Of Technology, University of Brussels, Belgium and the San Diego State University. According to the essay: “The dominance of this isotopic signature in archipelago lavas for 30 my and its presence in ~40 Ma gabbros is consistent with the previous interpretation that these are isotopic characteristics of the Kerguelen Plume." [119] Various tables [120] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at strong

disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of over a 44 billion year range! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age.

Age Dating Summary

Mt Rabouillere Summary	Age 87Rb/86Sr	Age 207Pb/206Pb	Age 206Pb/238U	Age 207Pb/235U	Age 208Pb/232Th
Average	21	5,008	4,903	4,975	6,142
Maximum	30	5,019	5,355	5,100	7,788
Minimum	-7	5,000	4,305	4,793	2,799
Difference	38	20	1,050	307	4,989

Table 70

Age Dating Summary

Mount Bureau Summary	Age 87Rb/86Sr	Age 207Pb/206Pb	Age 206Pb/238U	Age 207Pb/235U	Age 208Pb/232Th
Average	27	5,006	5,924	5,161	8,410
Maximum	30	5,020	23,366	8,496	44,378
Minimum	24	4,994	3,335	4,454	2,650
Difference	6	26	20,031	4,042	41,728

Table 71

Nature Of The Source Regions

According to the article [121] this lava from southern Tibet was dated in 2004 by scientists from the Open University in Milton Keynes, the University of Bristol and Cardiff University. According to the essay: “Most samples are Miocene in age, ranging from 10 to 25Ma in the south and 19Ma to the present day in northern Tibet" [122] Various tables [123] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at strong disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of over a 88 billion year range! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age.

Age Dating Summary

North Tibet Summary	208Pb/232Th Million Years	207Pb/235U Million Years	207Pb/206Pb Million Years	206Pb/238U Million Years
	11,420	5,136	4,980	7,783
87Rb/86Sr	11,350	5,138	4,980	8,023
Model Age	13,475	5,135	4,987	8,305
13 Million Years	11,504	5,140	4,989	7,349
	81,614	7,470	4,987	33,751
	88,294	7,471	4,991	33,742

Table 72

Age Dating Summary

South Tibet Summary	208Pb/232Th Million Years	207Pb/235U Million Years	207Pb/206Pb Million Years	206Pb/238U Million Years
	11,102	313	4,982	6,331
	6,092	946	4,919	5,799
87Rb/86Sr	9,265	266	4,980	6,682
Model Age	4,826	238	4,992	4,086
13 Million Years	8,205	294	4,980	5,567
	25,015	447	4,994	13,328
	33,191	482	4,992	15,053

Table 73

Generation Of Palaeocene Adakitic Andesites

According to the article [124] this rock formation from North Eastern China was dated in 2007 by scientists from China and Japan. According to the essay the true age is: "Palaeocene (c. 55-58Ma) adakitic andesites from the Yanji area." [124] Numerous table and charts affirm this as the true age. [125] A table [126] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at radical disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of over 10 billion years! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age.

Age Dating Summary

Dating Summary	87Rb/86Sr Age	207Pb/206Pb Age	208Pb/232Th Age	206Pb/238U Age	207Pb/235U Age
Average	51	5,022	8,941	8,754	5,908
Maximum	66	5,024	10,518	9,669	6,052
Minimum	40	5,020	7,800	7,403	5,641
Difference	26	3	2,718	2,266	411

Table 74

Evidence For A Widespread Tethyan

According to the article [127] this rock formation from North Eastern China was dated in 2007 by scientists from China and Japan. According to the essay the true age is: "Here, we report age-corrected Nd–Pb–Sr isotope data for 100–350 Ma basalt, diabase, and gabbro from widely separated Tethyan locations in Tibet, Iran, Albania, the eastern Himalayan syntaxis, and the seafloor off NW Australia (Fig. 1)." [128] The author concludes that the rocks are from the Cretaceous and Jurassic time periods: "We collected Early Jurassic to Early Cretaceous Neotethyan magmatic rocks in 1998 from outcrops along 1300 km of the Indus–Yarlung suture zone." [129] Several tables [130] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at radical disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of almost 60 billion years! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age.

Age Dating Summary

Dating Summary	87Rb/86Sr Age	207Pb/206Pb Age	208Pb/232Th Age	206Pb/238U Age
Average	168	4,999	22,356	7,014
Maximum	1,739	5,236	58,796	15,747
Minimum	0	4,982	10,699	5,042
Difference	1,739	254	48,096	10,705

Table 75

208Pb/232Th, Maximum Ages

208Pb/232Th	208Pb/232Th	208Pb/232Th	208Pb/232Th
58,796	29,705	18,607	11,427
54,206	27,710	18,121	11,377
48,252	27,422	17,797	11,366
47,976	26,674	17,787	11,241
46,117	26,369	17,591	10,718
42,203	25,972	17,536	10,699
42,192	25,590	17,054	10,699
41,604	25,096	16,053	10,300
41,343	24,010	15,299	9,357
41,231	22,718	14,340	8,632
39,637	22,307	13,845	8,486
38,125	22,228	13,772	8,057
37,115	21,827	13,652	6,497
35,012	21,560	13,404	5,573
33,584	19,910	13,403	5,425
31,556	19,594	13,006	4,869
31,286	19,148	12,171	
30,740	18,765	11,540	

Table 76

206Pb/238U, Maximum Ages

206Pb/238U	206Pb/238U	206Pb/238U	206Pb/238U	206Pb/238U
15,747	11,309	8,770	6,602	5,724
15,067	11,248	8,508	6,589	5,720
14,363	10,360	8,315	6,421	5,601
13,580	9,643	8,314	6,398	5,599
13,204	9,427	8,072	6,369	5,573
12,780	9,300	8,024	6,357	5,515
11,757	9,123	7,604	6,219	5,462
11,659	9,014	7,504	5,863	5,311
11,537	8,996	7,056	5,861	5,286
11,313	8,954	7,002	5,807	5,120

Table 77

Post-Collisional Potassic And Ultrapotassic

According to the article [131] this rock formation from south west Tibet was dated in 1999 by scientists from Austria. According to the essay the true age is: “Volcanic rocks from SW Tibet, with 40Ar/39Ar ages in the range 17–25 Ma." [131] Numerous table and charts affirm this as the true age. [132] Two tables [133] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at radical disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of almost 100 billion years! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age. The oldest date is 3,971 times older than the youngest date.

Age Dating Summary

87Rb/86Sr	207Pb/206Pb	208Pb/232Th	206Pb/238U
Maximum Age	Age	Age	Age
25	5,007	99,275	6,944
25	5,007	95,541	5,560
25	5,001	71,706	5,013
25	5,000	70,277	4,715
25	4,997	68,343	3,745
25	4,988	67,704	2,646

Table 78

Origin Of The Indian Ocean-Type Isotopic Signature

According to the article [134] this rock formation the Philippine Sea plate was dated in 1998 by scientists from Department of Geology, Florida International University, Miami. According to the essay the true age is: "Spreading centers in three basins, the West Philippine Basin (37-60 Ma), the Parece Vela Basin (18-31 Ma), and the Shikoku Basin (17-25 Ma) are extinct, and one, the Mariana Trough (0-6 Ma), is active (Figure 1)." [134] Numerous table and charts affirm this as the true age. [135] Two tables [136] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at radical disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of almost 100 billion years! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age. The oldest date is 3,971 times older than the youngest date.

Age Dating Summary

Dating	Age	Age	Age	Age	Age
Summary	87Rb/86Sr	147Sm/144Nd	207Pb/206Pb	206Pb/238U	208Pb/232Th
Average	42	41	4,960	4,260	8,373
Maximum	55	54	4,989	7,093	13,430
Minimum	19	20	4,921	1,904	3,065
Difference	37	33	68	5,188	10,365

Table 79

U–Th–Pb Dating Of Secondary Minerals

According to the article [137] this rock formation Yucca Mountain, Nevada was dated in 2008 by scientists from United States Geological Survey, Geological Survey of Canada, and the Australian National University. According to the essay the true age is unknown. [138] Other authors have affirmed the same problem. [139] Two tables [140] in the essay have isotopic ratios which can be calculated. As we can see below they are all at radical disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of almost 353 billion years! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age. The oldest date is 350,000 times older than the youngest date.

Age Dating Summary

Dating	207Pb/206Pb	206Pb/238U	208Pb/232Th	87Rb/86Sr
Summary	Age	Age	Age	Age
Average	3,459	4,891	9,984	12
Maximum	8,126	31,193	352,962	13
Minimum	-445	1	2	11
Difference	8,571	31,192	352,960	2

Table 80

Another table [141] in the essay has a list of calculated dates As we can see below they are all at radical disagreement with each other. There is a spread of dates of 82 billion years! None of the Uranium/Lead based dating methods even come vaguely close to the so called true age. The oldest date is 82,000 times older than the youngest date.

Age Dating Summary

Dating	206Pb/238U	207Pb/235U	208Pb/232Th	87Rb/86Sr
Summary	Age	Age	Age	Age
Average	1,540	46	7,687	12
Maximum	20,209	486	82,030	13
Minimum	1	0	3	11
Difference	20,208	486	82,027	2

Table 81

Conclusion

Brent Dalrymple states in his anti creationist book The Age of the Earth:

"Several events in the formation of the Solar System can be dated with considerable precision." [142]

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." [143]

I his book he gives a table [144] with radiometric dates of twenty meteorites. If you run the figures through Microsoft Excel, you will find that they are 98.7% in agreement. There is only a seven percent difference between the ratio of the smallest and oldest dates. As we have seen in this essay, such a perfect fit is attained by selecting data and ignoring other data. A careful study of the latest research shows that such perfection is illusionary at best. 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://www.bgc.org/isoplot_etc/isoplot.html

8 **Radioactive and Stable Isotope Geology, By H.G. Attendon, Chapman And Hall Publishers, 1997. Page 73 [Rb/Sr], 195 [K/Ar], 295 [Re/OS], 305 [Nd/Nd].**

9 Principles of Isotope Geology, Second Edition, By Gunter Faure, Published By John Wiley And Sons, New York, 1986. Pages 120 [Rb/Sr], 205 [Nd/Sm], 252 [Lu/Hf], 266 [Re/OS], 269 [Os/OS].

10 Absolute Age Determination, Mebus A. Geyh, Springer-Verlag Publishers, Berlin, 1990. Pages 80 [Rb/Sr], 98 [Nd/Sm], 108 [Lu/Hf], 112 [Re/OS].

11 Radiogenic Isotope Geology, Second Edition, By Alan P. Dickin, Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pages 43 [Rb/Sr], 70 [Nd/Sm], 205 [Re/OS], 208 [Pt/OS], 232 [Lu/Hf].

12 Early Archaean Rocks At Fyfe Hills, Precambrian Research, Volume 21, 1983, Pages 197

13 Reference 12, Page 211

14 Reference 12, Page 215

15 Shock-Melted Antarctic LL-Chondrites, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 1990, Voume 54, Pages 3509

16 Reference 15, Page 3517

17 Diamonds And Mantle-Derived Xenoliths, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 42, 1979, Pages 58

18 Reference 17, Page 66

19 Reference 17, Page 64

20 87Rb-87Sr Isochron Of The Norton County Achondrite, Earth And Planetary Science Letters, Volume 3, 1967, Pages 179

21 Reference 20, Page 182

22 Base and Precious Metal Veins, Economic Geology, Volume 97, 2002, Pages 23

23 Reference 22, Page 27, 28

24 Reference 22, Page 29

25 Reference 22, Page 34-37

26 The Munchberg Massif, Southern Germany, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 99, 1990, Pages 230

27 Rocks of the Central Wyoming Province, Canadian Journal Of Earth Science, 2006, Volume 43, Pages 1419

28 Reference 27, Page 1436-1437

29 Reference 27, Page 1439

30 Basalts From Apollo 15, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 17, 1973, Pages 324

31 Reference 30, Page 334

32 Reference 30, Page 332

33 History Of The Pasamonte Achondrite, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 37, 1977, Pages 1

34 Reference 33, Pages 3, 9

35 **Sr Isotopic Composition Of Afar Volcanics, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 50, 1980, Pages 247**

36 **Reference 35, Page 249**

37 **Reference 35, Page 250, 251**

38 **Orogenic Lherzolite Complexes, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 51, 1980, Pages 71**

39 **Reference 37, Page 72**

40 **Reference 37, Pages 78-80**

40 **Isotopic Geochemistry (O, Sr, Pb), Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 61, 1982, Pages 97**

41 **Reference 40, Pages 101, 102**

42 **Reference 40, Pages 104**

43 **Cretaceous-Tertiary Boundary Sediments, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 64, 1983, Pages 356**

44 **Reference 43, Pages 361**

45 **Correlated N D, Sr And Pb Isotope Variation, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 59, 1982, Pages 327**

46 **Reference 45, Pages 330, 331**

47 **A Depleted Mantle Source For Kimberlites, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 73, 1985, Pages 269**

48 **Reference 47, Pages 270**

49 **Reference 47, Pages 271, 273**

50 **Sm-Nd Isotopic Systematics, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 71, 1984, Pages 46**

51 **Reference 50, Pages 49**

52 **Strontium, Neodymium And Lead Compositions, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 75, 1985, Pages 354-368**

53 **Reference 52, Pages 356, 363**

54 **Trace Element And Sr And Nd Isotope, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 80, 1986, Pages 281-298**

55 **Reference 54, Pages 287**

56 **Reference 54, Pages 289**

57 **The southeast Australian Lithosphere Mantle, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 86, 1987, Pages 327**

58 **Reference 57, Pages 332**

59 **Reference 57, Pages 330, 332**

60 Strontium, neodymium and lead isotopic, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 90, 1988, Pages 26-40

61 Reference 60, Pages 35

62 Reference 60, Pages 31

63 Sr, Nd, and Os isotope geochemistry, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 99, 1990, Pages 362

64 Reference 63, Pages 364

65 Reference 63, Pages 365, 368

66 Pb, Nd and Sr isotopic geochemistry, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 105, 1991, Pages 149

67 Reference 66, Pages 154, 160

67 Reference 66, Pages 156, 157

68 Sr, Nd, and Pb isotopes, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 113, 1992, Pages 107

69 Reference 68, Pages 110

70 Production of Jurassic Rhyolite, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 134, 1995, Pages 23-36

71 Reference 70, Pages 25

72 Evolution of Reunion Hotspot Mantle, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 134, 1995, Pages 169-185

73 Reference 72, Pages 173

73 Reference 72, Pages 174

74 Reference 72, Pages 180

75 An extremely low U/Pb source, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 1993, Volume 57, Pages 4687-4702

76 Reference 75, Pages 4690, 4691

77 The 72 Ma Geochemical Evolution, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 183, 2000, Pages 73

78 Reference 77, Pages 76-79

79 The Himalayan collision zone, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 244, 2006, Pages 234

80 Reference 79, Pages 234, 235

81 Reference 79, Pages 238

82 Reference 79, Pages 242

83 Evidence for a Non Magmatic Component, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2001, Volume 65, Number 4, Pages 571

84 Reference 83, Pages 581

85 Reference 83, Pages 576, 577

86 The Origin of Geochemical Diversity, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, Volume 71, 2007, Pages 3656

87 Reference 86, Pages 3661

88 Reference 86, Pages 3660

89 Mechanisms for Incompatible-Element Enrichment, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, Volume 73, 2009, Pages 3963

90 Reference 89, Pages 3967

91 Constraints on Martian Differentiation Processes, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 1997, Volume 61, Number 22, Pages 4915

92 Reference 91, Pages 4918, 4924

93 Geochemistry of the Volcan de l'Androy, Journal Of Petrology, 2008, Volume 49, Number 6, Pages 1069

94 Reference 93, Pages 1078

95 Continental Lithospheric Contribution, Journal Of Petrology, 1997, Volume 38, Number 1, Pages 115

96 Reference 95, Pages 119

97 Reference 95, Pages 124

98 Garnet Granulite Xenoliths, Journal Of Petrology, 2001, Volume 42, Number 4, Pages 731

99 Reference 98, Pages 742, 743

100 Reference 98, Pages 737-740

101 http://petrology.oxfordjournals.org/content/suppl/2001/04/27/42.4.731.DC1/ege033SUPPLEM.csv

102 The Isotope and Trace Element Budget, Journal Of Petrology, 2000, Volume 41, Number 6, Pages 759

103 Reference 102, Pages 772-774

104 Fluid Flow and Diffusion, Journal Of Petrology, 1997, Volume 38, Number 11, Pages 1489

105 Reference 104, Pages 1497

106 Reference 104, Pages 1498

107 Reference 104, Pages 1492-1495

108 Temporal Evolution of the Lithospheric Mantle, Journal Of Petrology, 2009, Volume 50, Number 10, Pages 1857

109 Reference 108, Pages 1873, 1874, 1877, 1879, 1880

110 Petrogenesis and Origins of Mid-Cretaceous, Journal Of Petrology, 2010, Volume 51, Number 10, Pages 2003-2045

111 Reference 110, Pages 2038

112 Reference 110, Pages 2024-2026

113 The Petrogenetic Association of Carbonatite, Journal Of Petrology, 1999, Volume 40, Number 4, Pages 525

114 Reference 113, Pages 534, 535

115 Geochemistry of Jurassic Oceanic Crust, Journal Of Petrology, 1998, Volume 39, Number 5, Pages 859–880

116 Reference 115, Pages 867, 868

117 The age of Dar al Gani 476, Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta, 2003, Volume 67, Number 18, Pages 3519–3536

118 Reference 117, Pages 3523

119 Petrogenesis of the Flood Basalts, Journal Of Petrology, 1998, Volume 39, Number 4, Pages 711–748

120 Reference 119, Pages 729, 730

121 Nature of the Source Regions, Journal Of Petrology, 2004, Volume 45, Number 3, Pages 555

122 Reference 121, Pages 556

123 Reference 121, Pages 566, 575, 576

124 Generation of Palaeocene Adakitic Andesites, Journal Of Petrology, 2007, Volume 48, Number 4, Pages 661

125 Reference 124, Pages 676-678

126 Reference 124, Pages 684

127 Evidence for a Widespread Tethyan, Journal Of Petrology, 2005, Volume 46, Number 4, Pages 829-858

128 Reference 127, Pages 831

129 Reference 127, Pages 840

130 Reference 127, Pages 832-837

131 Post-Collisional Potassic and Ultrapotassic , Journal Of Petrology, 1999, Volume 40, Number 9, Pages 1399-1424

132 Reference 131, Pages 1403, 1405, 1406

133 Reference 131, Pages 1414, 1415

134 Origin of the Indian Ocean-type isotopic signature, Journal Of Geophysical Research, 1998, Volume 103, Number B9, Pages 20,963

135 Reference 134, Pages 20965, 20969

136 **Reference 134, Pages 20968, 20969**

137 **U–Th–Pb Dating Of Secondary Minerals, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2008, Volume 72, Pages 2067**

138 **Reference 137, Pages 2067, 2068**

139 **Reference 137, Pages 2072-2073, 2074**

140 **Reference 137, Pages 2080, 2081**

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

143 **Reference 142, Page 23**

144 **Reference 142, Page 287**

www.creation.com