

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***  
*107 East Austin*  
*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*  
*830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org*

**C1022 – June 23, 2010 – Isochron Discordance & Carbon Dating**

Okay, we want to conclude today our analysis of radioisotope dating under the principle of 2 Pet 3:4, that there are no such things as universal constants in creation and therefore radioisotope decay has been accelerated on one or more occasions in the past. And I hope by doing this it will take the wind out of what you hear daily about the age of this fossil, the age of that rock, the millions and billions of year talk. Just out yesterday, the news reported a 3.6 million year old fossil that expands the human family tree. See, now we're not building the family tree, it's assumed to be complete, now we're expanding it. A total farce. Here's what the article says, "A new partial skeleton of an early hominid known as *Australopithecus afarensis* was discovered in a mud flat of the Afar region of Ethiopia. Dated about 3.6 million years ago, the find is about 400,000 years older than the famous Lucy." Lucy has already been determined to be an ape. We'll be looking at the so-called human ancestors, ape men, cave men and men-men later in our class. But just about every week I get some news article related to radioisotope dating where millions and billions of years are spouted off as fact. Look at that, 3.6 million years ago. How do you know that? Constants. So we've been going through some of the recent research of the RATE project that challenges these so-called constants. RATE stands for Radioisotopes and the Age of The Earth. The RATE Project was organized by a group of creation scientists, all Christians, all with Ph.D.'s in various fields of science. These scientists came along in the wake of Morris and Whitcomb's 1961 book, *The Genesis Flood*. They're all Counter Attack Strategists. They saw that 150 years of Accommodation did more to undermine the integrity of Scripture than to reconcile the Bible and modern science. There are other Christians who are scientists or philosophers who still do the Accommodation thing but they're not doing scientific experiments like the RATE group is doing. Hugh Ross can talk forever about Progressive Creationism but he's not doing any

scientific research, he's just talking. RATE scientists are doing science, they're taking the biblical model and thinking through the predictions based on the model and going out and doing the experiments. Now that these scientists have essentially finished RATE they are working on a new research effort called FAST. FAST stands for Flood-Activated Sedimentation and Tectonics. And I just want to point out as a fact that the RATE/FAST scientists are the real hardcore scientist people who give their full allegiance to the Bible and I don't find Accommodationists doing this kind of research. What do I find them doing? Talking.

We've looked at six or seven different accommodation attempts, all designed to get more time into the early Genesis text. I showed you that textually none of the attempts work, they're not consistent with sound exegesis of the text. From the text you have to conclude the earth is young. You can play with the Hebrew for day, *yom* in Gen 1, you can fudge with the chronologies in Gen 5 and 11 but you still haven't dealt with the bigger issues. You still haven't dealt with the ages of the pre-Flood patriarchs, you still haven't dealt with the longevity decay curve in the post-Flood aftermath, and you still haven't dealt with the evidence of a highly advanced ancient civilization in the post-Flood world. So the problems are a little bigger than the word *yom* in Gen 1, they're a little bigger than a *waw* + noun in Gen 1:2. There's a whole structure to this thing that is centering on the Global Flood of Noah. That event becomes critical in the interpretation of geological history.

This is practical and here's why: every event in Scripture teaches a certain doctrine or doctrines. It's because the events are historical that the doctrines taught by those events are true. What am I saying here? If these events like Creation, the Fall and the Global Flood didn't happen then the doctrines those events teach aren't true. How do you get truth out of myth? Truth comes out of history not mythology. So if we want to hold on to the truths of these events we've got to hold on to the historicity of these events. There are linkages, not linkages superimposed by my mind, linkages built by God Himself such that when I think of the Global Flood there are certain doctrines that naturally connect to that event. What are they? The doctrine of judgment/salvation. The Global Flood of Noah is a powerful picture of God as judge and savior. Let's think through this because the Accommodation strategies almost always argue for a Local Flood, the Counter-Attack Strategy says no, the Bible teaches a Global Flood. We've been through the

arguments, Those are the two views. Both say a Flood happened but the extent of the Flood differs radically. And if that's the case then how does that affect the way I view God, judgment and salvation.

For one, take the doctrine of salvation. Obviously, the biblical narrative teaches there is only one way of salvation. What was it? The ark. The ark is the picture of the saving vessel. Who designed it? God designed it. God revealed the plans to Noah. Why did God have to do that? Why couldn't God have said, Noah, I'm sending a flood, go build a boat? Because Noah doesn't know the nature of the judgment coming? He doesn't know about water turbulence, sedimentation and mud slides. How is he going to construct a boat that can weather a global catastrophe. It's just like salvation, we don't write the plan of salvation. Why not? Because we don't know the depths of what it is we have to be saved from. God does. So just as God authored the design of the ark so God authored the design of the cross of Christ. To design a way of salvation through an event that we don't know completely is impossible. But God in His omniscience graciously reveals the one way of salvation. But let's say we are accommodating and we posit a local flood in the Mesopotamian valley. Now how many ways of salvation are there? I could still get on the ark, but I could also just migrate a few hundred miles and be out of the flood zone. So now I've got two ways of salvation. Do you see how that doesn't fit? These attempts to slip and slide around the text don't work. When you try to get around it you still haven't dealt with the question of how many ways of salvation are there. It's foolish really because you end up undermining the doctrine of salvation. While you have salvation going on inside the ark what do you have going on outside the ark? Judgment, and is it just a partial judgment, a local judgment or a total judgment? Once again, if you say it's just a local judgment then what do we have to say when we come to the NT data concerning the second coming of Christ. The event that the second coming of Christ is always likened to is the flood of Noah. If the flood of Noah was a local judgment what's the second coming of Christ going to be, a local return with a local judgment? Does that fit? That doesn't carry the Spirit of truth. It also diminishes the power and holiness of God. He just smashed one area of the earth; He didn't smash the whole thing. So all this is connected to very precious doctrines that if you yank them back here you contort them over here. That's why every truth in Scripture has to be kept in close proximity to every other truth. If you don't and you let them get too far

away from one another then they lose touch and you wind up holding to contradictions when God doesn't contradict Himself.

So we structured the course to start with the Scriptures first and we spent weeks going through the question: what does the Bible say about the age of the earth. The Bible is special revelation, it's specific revelation, and it's verbal revelation in the form of propositions. And we concluded from the propositions of Scripture that you can't get more time in Genesis than what is permitted by the numerics given in Scripture, namely, about 6,000 years. So we start with the word of God as our ultimate presupposition. That's our starting point; we're not ashamed to say that's our starting point. We start with God's word. If you don't start with that where do you have to start? With man's word. That's the only alternative. You'll have people say, well, you're just believing in an ancient book, that's the attack. How do you respond to the attack? You don't apologize for the Bible. The best defense is a good offense. Turn it around: well, you're just believing man's opinion, how do you know man's opinions are correct. Man has been wrong before, many, many times. So two can play the game. We're admitting we start with God's word. They're starting with man's word.

Now what we're doing is turning to general revelation and seeing what general revelation says about the age of the earth. Nature is general revelation, it speaks to us. Job says, let the beasts teach you, let the earth teach you, let the birds teach you. It speaks, not propositionally, but it does communicate a message, namely that God has done all this, so it's revelatory of Him. So I want you to catch that we're putting the general revelation under the authority of the specific revelation. We're not putting them on the same level of authority; we're putting the Scriptures first, then nature second. That's critical because not only are most Christians not doing that, but the Scriptures tell us that nature and the interpretation of nature are subject to the word of God. So we can't just go out and autonomously interpret nature and then come back to the Bible and say what does God say, and can I get the Bible to say this by manipulating the text a little bit because I find some word does have this usage in some other context and I import it into this context. That's not exegeting the text, that's reading into the text what you want to find to fit your autonomous interpretation of nature. The Bible always comes first, always!

So we say, from biblical numerics, the earth is ~6,000 years old and then we look at the evidence in the earth. We find Helium in Zircons, we find Po Radiohalos in Granites, these kinds of things. We look at that evidence and we say, that has to be interpreted in terms of the word of God. And the fantastic thing is that we are finding, in the rocks of the earth, things that point to an old earth and things that point to a young earth. Yeah, you heard me right, evidence that points to an old earth and evidence that points to a young earth. The problem is how to reconcile these...I turn to 2 Pet 3:4 and I learn that I should not presuppose that there are such a thing as universal constants in creation. The scientific community says there are such things as universal constants in creation. If I presuppose what the modern scientific community presupposes then I create a contradiction. The amount of Ur 238 decay says the rock is billions of years old the amount of He 4 says the rock is ~6,000 years. So Peter is instructive because he gives me a way to reconcile the age differences. Modern scientific presuppositions don't give me a way to reconcile the two. Peter says, Christian, you are not constrained to the speculations of modern science. There are other explanations. So when I go to listen to the earth and what it teaches, if I discover something that under present condition extrapolated backwards in past time gives me an age of the universe that is way out of line with Scripture then that tells me there's more to the story; I haven't uncovered all the data. That's why, when we looked at the amount of Pb 206 in these zircons and we discovered that at present decay rates of Ur 238 the amount of Pb 206 indicates 1.5 billion years of decay, that can't be a constant decay rate because the Scriptures say the earth is only ~6,000 years old. So I go back to the drawing board and I discover that the more to the story is that there is also He 4 in the rock and the amounts of He 4 in the rock indicates only ~6,000 years worth of decay have occurred. Now I'm getting the picture that the Ur-Pb decay clock has been accelerated at one or more periods in history. That's why creation science is important. It's not stopping at the first indication that the earth is 1.5 billion years old and publishing it in *Science* magazine, that's just a half-truth. It looks for other evidence, other things in the rocks that an evolutionist would never look for because it's not sympathetic to his position. We're simply applying 2 Pet 3:4.

And we're finding there's much more to the story in the rocks than we've been told. And as we uncover those stories here's what's happening. What I'm about to say is very offensive to many evangelicals who hold to long ages.

We've had, for 200 years, attempts by well-meaning Christians, to accommodate to long ages. Now what we're finding is that they were accommodating to an incomplete story. Now that the whole story is coming in and it's telling us the earth is young, why are we still accommodating???

There's nothing to accommodate to. There's no reason in special or general revelation for getting more time in Genesis. We don't need more time. But people, including Christians, are prideful and pride is a block. People who have been holding to long ages for years and years are not just going to drop it and come over to the biblical view. Let's face it; it's embarrassing to say you've been wrong for forty years, especially if you're published.

Here's what's going on and here's what we're saying. Think of this as a chain of logic. People come along and they say I am a Christian, "I believe God's Word." Then they go out in the world and they hear over and over that science has looked at the data and the data prove the earth is old. There's a little deception that happens right here in the second chain of logic, it's not the data that prove the earth is old, it's a scientific interpretation of data that is said to prove the earth is old. It's their spin put on a limited data set that says the earth is old. But the Christian thinks science has proven an old earth so then he comes back to God's Word and he re-interprets God's word to fit proven science, using one or more of these techniques - Theistic Evolution, Framework Hypothesis, Progressive Creationism, Gaps in Genealogies, Old Earth Gap Theory or Creation by Evolution. What we're saying is that the problem is right in the center. Scientific Interpretation of Data Proves an Old Earth. That's where the problem is, because now we're finding that there are things in the earth that simply won't allow an old earth interpretation. They're blocks to that. He in the Zircons, Po Radiohalos in the Granites, etc...So if step two in the logic chain breaks down and now I'm looking at a young earth then step three is obviously wrong. Why re-interpret God's word when there is no need to re-interpret? The last 200 years of accommodationist strategies has been a complete waste of time. There was nothing to accommodate to in the first place except the vain imaginations of secular scientists who didn't have all the data and didn't interpret the data correctly.

All I'm saying is stop doing these things because it's undermining the authority of God's word. You're not really believing God's word; you're believing what you want to believe, you're believing in your imagination, it's an idol, a projection of an imagined reality that doesn't exist.

### 3. Theoretical Explanations for Accelerated Decay

We've been looking at radioisotopes, the Icon of Evolution. Radioisotopes are basically clocks. There are certain assumptions involved in these clocks. I gave you an acronym; CIA. The CIA investigates and we're doing a little investigation of these assumptions. Assumption one is Constant rate of decay. That means the clock never changes its rate of ticking. We're told, many scientists will tell you, "That cannot change." Peter says they have changed, nothing is constant but God. So we've been investigating some of the indications that indeed radioactive decay rates have changed. There are other factors involved in the argument but I think I've summarized well-enough the argument so that it can be understood and communicated on a lay level if you wanted to share this with someone, help move them out of their lethargy and think for a minute or discuss it with a professional geologist. Both of these experiments show that in the past there has been accelerated decay. The clocks were sped up for some period of time or times such that the ages they are yielding are far greater than actual passage of time.

But what could cause radioisotope clocks to accelerate? If you claimed this to any physicist he would immediately object by arguing that theoretical and experimental considerations have shown that today they change by less than 1% even under extreme variations in temperature, pressure and chemical conditions. However, some recent reports in the scientific literature show that small changes in the energy structure of the nucleus of an atom can alter the stability of the nucleus in dramatic ways. Now, what I'm trying to say here is that it has been shown, theoretically speaking, that small energy changes in the nucleus can cause accelerated decay. Now, this is all theory, they haven't done this, there have been no experiments done to produce conditions that could cause acceleration. But you have to understand that the reason they haven't done them is simply because it is beyond our ability at this time. The US government with all its money and labs cannot do these experiments. So, all we can do here is apply nuclear theory and do the math to theoretically simulate experimental conditions. But nobody can experimentally do it. So, on a lay level, what Dr Chaffin, the nuclear physicist with ICR, has shown (he's a guy who sits around and thinks about string theory all day, things like that), is that under current nuclear theory if you



decrease the amount of energy necessary to release the alpha or beta particles then you can accelerate decay rates dramatically. That makes sense; it would be like making the second hand on a clock move easier. That would speed things up. But this is just a possibility. I mention it, we don't know what conditions could actually do this, but we do know that accelerated decay has occurred. The RATE group concludes, "we...may never...be able to identify the primary mechanism God actually may have used. Because God is the eternal, all-powerful agent of Creation and the Genesis Flood, then He can simultaneously manipulate many possible variables in His Creation. With all our best efforts we might never discover exactly how or what He did to cause accelerated decay. However, we conceivably might be able from such studies to uncover some relevant interrelationships and estimate the magnitudes of certain parameter variations. We need to remember, however, that God is external and independent of His Creation, and during periods of intervention in the normal operation of His universe He is not necessarily bound to follow what we call natural law." That to point out that while these events may involve miracle, we're not invoking those unless there is clear indication in the text of Scripture. Sometimes Christians just want to explain it all by miracle. But you have to go with the text and the general rule of thumb in the text is that God does not use miracles; He uses the normal order of His governance. With the Flood, when you read the text it appears to have both miraculous and normal factors but the normal factors seem to be the major factors while the miraculous factors are the minor ones. But when we go to Creation the major fact is miracle and the minor factor is normal processes. If you discuss these things with unbelievers and you invoke miraculous explanations they'll attack you ferociously. Why they do that - they don't like interventions, they're insisting that their way of knowing all things is the only way of knowing things. We disagree; we say the primary way of knowing is revelation. We have to admit that we're not embarrassed by that. But we don't say everything is a miracle. When we go to explain things in the earth we have to follow the Scriptural indicators as to the miraculous vs normal factors involved in the phenomena.

#### E. Isochron Discordance

We've pointed out some theoretical explanations that could accelerate decay. Now I want to look at some more evidence. To do this I want to prepare you by introducing the standard Geologic Column.



Era	Age	Period
Cenozoic	65mya to today	Quaternary Tertiary
Mesozoic	248 to 65mya	Cretaceous Jurassic Triassic
Paleozoic	543 to 248mya	Permian Pennsylvanian Mississippian Devonian Silurian Ordovician Cambrian
PreCambrian	4.6bya to 543mya	Proterozoic Archaean Hadean

This is what you find in all the textbooks and as we focus our attention more and more on the Global Flood event of Noah we want to become more and more familiar with this Column. If we were to take a cross-section of the earth geologists say this is what we would find. Actually, John Woodmorappe has shown that it's actually only present in less than 1% of the earth's crust, so what we see in the textbooks is actually a composite of all the earth's data. But in any case, in this composite at the very bottom you see Precambrian, that's the oldest rock and as you move up the column you get to the younger rock.<sup>1</sup> Let me explain some of these other terms in this chart.

You see the terms Paleozoic above Precambrian. That comes from two words, paleo- meaning old and -zoic meaning life. So Paleozoic is "old life." Then, in the middle you have Mesozoic and Meso- means middle so Mesozoic means "middle life." Ceno- means young so Cenozoic means "young life." Now we don't have a problem at all saying that the Paleozoic sediments are older than the layers above. We agree with that. Obviously they were laid down before the layers on top of them (unless we see an inversion and there would be evidence of that in the rock). How much older is where we have disagreement. Modern geology is saying it took 4.6 billion years for these strata to form. Biblically we're saying they took only ~6,000 thousand years to form. So it's the difference once more between gradually laying down the strata according to uniformitarian processes vs rapidly laying down the strata according to catastrophic processes.

Now most of these rocks are sedimentary and sedimentary rocks by definition are laid down by moving water. The only non-sedimentary rock are the Precambrian. If there's any sedimentary rock on the Precambrian it's just a

thin layer on top, what they've called proterozoic because that's sort of where you find, extremely rare, but you do sometimes find fossils of what they call "earlier life," that's the very early stages of cellular life. Before that in the lowest Precambrian, no life, no fossils are found. I introduced this because now we're going to look at some rocks from the Precambrian.

Think with me through the logic first. Here's an illustration, then we'll look at the science. Let's say I have four highly accurate clocks all in the same room, at the same elevation. We start them all at 12 noon. They are all powered by batteries. Assuming that no one sneaks into the room and moves the clock hands, assuming that no one takes out the batteries for a while and puts them back in, assuming the batteries don't run out of juice, we'll just say they keep going and going and going, like Energizer says. Assuming all those things, when we come back into the room should all four clocks give us the same time? Yes. This should be how they read. What would you assume if they didn't read the same? Something's tampered with the clocks. It's that simple. Now here's where we turn to radioisotopes. There are four other popular radioisotope clocks, (Ur-Pb we've seen) Sm-Nd, K-Ar, Rb-Sr, Pb-Pb, just like our illustration. Now, if these four clocks are in the same rock and there's been no tampering inside the rock, they all started with the same initial conditions, they all decay at a constant rate and I date the same rock by each of these four clocks, SHOULD all four clocks give the same age of the rock? Of course. All four radioisotope clocks should give me the same age, within acceptable statistical error, if those assumptions are met. Here's the problem, they don't, significant differences are found. And this is in the secular literature, it should be well-known. There are no excuses for a scientist today missing this.

What Dr Steve Austin of the RATE group did, (he's the guy who probably knows more about Mt St Helens and Spirit Lake than any living scientist, another kook, published in numerous peer reviewed geology journals, is at the forefront of modern geology and there's nothing the secular scientists can say, the guy is coming up with catastrophic models of geological processes that we can observe and test in the laboratory, this is the kind of guy that gets picked on by the die hard evolution community, but when the guy's work comes under scrutiny, there's nothing you can say, the guy's work is tight), is he said I'm going to take two Precambrian rocks that are easily datable. Remember, Precambrian are the era of oldest rocks in the Geologic Column.

He chose Amphibolite from the Beartooth Mountains of Wyoming and a Diabase Sill from the wall of Grand Canyon. These are both igneous rocks which means they formed from lava or magma. These are the kinds of rocks you can date because when the rock melts it resets the radioactive clocks, so when the magma rocks cool all the clocks read the same time, then starts the decay. If the rates of decay are constant then all four radioactive clocks should give us the same age, the same time; that is, they should show concordant ages. What he found though was that each radioactive clock gave significantly different ages or what they call discordance, it just means the clocks didn't agree. He used the most advanced technology available. He dated the rocks by two different methods, whole rock and mineral and the results are that when you compare one clock, say Rb-Sr with K-Ar, by either method, they disagree on how old the rock is. They also found that if you compared the Rb-Sr whole rock age with the Rb-Sr mineral age in the same rock you got about the same age. But Rb-Sr clock compared with any other clock gave significantly different ages. What's the logical conclusion? Would the real clock please stand up? Which clock is telling the right time? We have no way of knowing. In fact, I suggest that none of them are right. And what this tells us is that, once again, there is no constant rate of decay. The ages they give of the Amphibolite and Diabase Sill are great ages, in the billions of years, but way different than each other, so at one or more periods in the past radioactive decay rates have been accelerated from present rates we observe today. He also learned that alpha decayers consistently gave older ages while beta decayers consistently gave younger ages. But the bottom line is that no matter what method was used; whole rock or mineral, the four clocks in the same Precambrian rocks gave significantly different ages. And that simply should not be if radioactive decay occurs at Constant rates. Radioisotope clocks are broken clocks and need to be repaired. He concludes, "Not only has the RATE group documented that different radioisotope dating methods disagree with one another, but that the estimated "ages" must be wrong by many orders of magnitude...because Biblical chronology as well as other RATE findings indicate the earth is no more than ten thousand years old, and whereas many rocks are dated more than one billion years old, standard radioisotope dating for such rocks is wrong by at least a factor of 100,000."

#### F. Carbon-14

Alright, let's look at one more thing, then next week we'll move into the fossil record. The fossil record is an evidence of sin and judgment. We'll look at dinosaurs, when did they live, were they co-habitants of earth with man? What about ape-men. Is there such a thing? And why are the continents in the shapes they are; that deals with tectonics, issues like that, then we'll be near the end of our class. The one more thing we want to point out today is C14. You've probably heard of carbon dating, C14 is another radioisotope. The RATE group didn't set out to do any research on C14 because a lot of work has already been done. But it came to their attention that secular scientists were publishing reports in a journal called *Radiocarbon*, that C14 was being found in coal and other very, very old rocks, deep down in the geological record. So they decided to investigate. C14 has a half life of 5,730 years so after about ten half-lives it can't be detected by modern equipment, that's about 60,000 years. So it's not good beyond that and they tell you this in the college classroom - we can't date things by C14 over about 50-60,000 years old. The neat thing about C14 is it gets into our tissues, so it's used to date breathing organisms. When an organism dies they stop breathing, so they stop taking in C14 and C12. If we know the atmospheric proportions and we know C14 decay rate is a constant then we can calculate how old the fossil of the organism is. The assumption is that the ration of C14 to C12 in our atmosphere is at equilibrium, which just means their proportions aren't changing. So that they're the same today as they were when the organism died. We actually know it's not at equilibrium, we know that at the present influx of C14 in the atmosphere that it would take maximum of 30,000 years to reach equilibrium. So if we're not at equilibrium yet, what does that mean? It means our atmosphere is not older than 30,000 years. That's an argument for a young atmosphere. We're dealing with arguments for a young earth so we won't continue that argument.

### 1. Detected in Every Layer of Geological Column

But in any case, here's what they found? Dr Baumgardner did this research, he's another one of those stupid creationists, he got his B.S. in electrical engineering from Texas Tech University, my alma mater, an M.S. in electrical engineering from Princeton University, and an M.S. and Ph.D. in geophysics and space physics from UCLA. These are the ignorant kind of people that are cast into the flat earth society for bringing into question mainstream science. What he did was take 70 samples from throughout the

various strata of the Geologic Column and look for C14. He found it in virtually every layer. Now, if that's the case, and we're finding C14 in Pennsylvanian coal, dated at around 300 million years old, what is it doing there? It should have been gone after 50,000 years. That's sort of a little problem. His conclusions, he was afraid, would be challenged because you could argue that the C14 leached into the coal because coal is porous.

## 2. Detected in Diamonds

So what Dr Baumgardner did was go one step further and test diamonds. What do you know about diamonds? How could testing diamonds strengthen or weaken his conclusion? Diamonds are extremely hard, they're not porous, so C14 can't leech into diamonds, and there can't be any contamination. Evolutionists firmly believe diamonds were formed 1-3 billion years ago. But what Baumgardner found was that all 12 diamonds he had analyzed by top laboratories contained detectable amounts of C14 that were greater than the background C14 in the surrounding rock. What does that mean? It means the diamonds formed less than 50,000 years ago. And we know from the Scriptures it was far less, they were formed perhaps during Creation and the Flood when radioactive decay rates were accelerated.

Let me sort of wrap this all up, all the talk about radioisotopes. Radioisotopes are a bankrupt method of determining an absolute age of the earth. Various radioisotope clocks in the same rock disagree on the age of the rock. This means that the assumption of constant rate of decay is wrong. C14 discovered in almost every strata of the geologic column and in diamonds means that the assumption of constant rate of decay is wrong.

Further research has shown evidence of accelerated decay on one or more occurrences in the past. The presence of 1.5 billion years of Ur238 decay to Pb206 but also with large quantities of the He 4 decay byproduct in the surrounding biotite indicates the 1.5 billion years of decay took place not long ago at an accelerated rate. Experimental data confirm the creation model of ~6,000 years ago.

The discovery of dark Po radiohalos that derived from Ur decay in every strata of the Geologic Column argues that at least 100 million years of Ur

decay occurred in a very short period of 6-10 days so that the short-life Po radiohalos could be captured.

Theoretical explanations have been given for accelerated decay. If the energy of activation needed to eject an alpha or beta particle out of the nucleus is decreased then accelerated nuclear decay could occur. This cannot be confirmed by experiment at this time by any laboratory in the world and we may never figure out how God did it but we may be able to discover some parameters for how He worked in the earth during these catastrophic periods.

The chief biblical events that can provide explanatory power to these data are the Creation and the Flood event. Careful textual analysis of these texts predict such explanations. There is no need for Christians to accommodate to long geological ages since they do not exist. Christians should be aware that the scientific community has not told the whole story and now that the whole story is coming in it is in agreement with what the Bible has said all along and what Christians have believed almost unanimously until just 200 years ago. The earth is young, 6,000 years young. Alright, I want to take some questions.

I'll give you another example, this one using the K-Ar method and this one on the known age of a rock. "After the May 18, 1980, eruption of Mount St. Helens in Washington state, a new lava dome began developing from October 26, 1980, onwards within the volcano's crater." When the rock heats up and turns into lava it resets the clock and we observed this, so we know when the K-Ar clock zeroed out and started counting. "In 1986, less than ten years after it flowed and cooled, a dacite lava from this dome was sampled and analyzed. The lava flow yielded a potassium-argon "age" of 350,000 years for the whole rock, and the constituent minerals yielded potassium-argon ages up to 2.8 million years." So here we know the rock is less than 10 years old and these are the ages we get, 350,000 years for the whole rock age and up to 2.8 million years for the constituent mineral age. To put it lightly, that's a slight problem. Why are we getting these whacky ages. Something is wrong with radioisotope clocks.

On another occasion ten Zaire diamonds were tested and found to be 6 billion years old This is a serious problem because the earth is only 4.6 billion years

old. How could the diamonds be older than the earth? Obviously excess argon was somehow altering the amount of parent-daughter (this is called excess argon). This contradicts assumption 3 above and shows that the K-Ar method is corrupt and cannot be used to accurately measure the age of rocks.

---

<sup>i</sup> This is known as the Principle of Superposition.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010