

It's Your Birthday! (Again!?!)

As I am sure you can imagine, it would be mighty difficult to put billions of candles on one birthday cake. A few thousand get pretty crowded already. However, there are numerous other scientific reasons to believe the earth is only thousands of years old. Here are my ten favorite.

I. Lunar Dust:

NASA calculated the depth of the lunar dust on the moon based on cosmic dust influx guesstimates and the evolutionary model of billions of years. By some NASA scientist's calculations, the depth of the dust should have been 50 to 60 feet deep, easily enough to swallow the entire landing module. Since this could have been a legitimate concern, NASA measured the depth of this dust with an unmanned lunar landing module prior to the first manned landing. The measurements showed only a few inches of dust, and they chalked the discrepancy off to erroneous dust influx rate assumptions. Never the less, they must not have been overly confident in their measurements. They still built large pods on the landing feet to get as large a footprint as possible to keep from sinking deep into the dust, "just in case they inadvertently landed in a crater where the dust might be substantially deeper."

II. The Receding Moon:

The moon could have never been in an orbit less than the Roche limit of 11,500 miles. (That's where it would break apart and fall out of the sky.) However, by calculating the present orbit of the moon based on the present rate of recession, a 4.5 billion year age, and an initial orbit of 11,500 miles; the moon should be substantially further away!

III. The Earth's Shape:

Calculating the shape of the earth; given 3 to 3.5 billion years to cool, the earth should be substantially more pear-shaped than it is.

IV. Radiometric Halos:

The decay of polonium 218, with a half life of only 3 minutes, can be found in granite. The location of these polonium halos found near uranium 238 halos indicates that the earth had to "cool" in only a few minutes, as opposed to billions of years.

V. Ocean Aging via sedimentation:

Studies have determined estimated flow rates of sedimentation from the rivers into the ocean and the amount of sediment in the ocean. The calculation of the earth's age, based on this data shows that the earth could not possibly be over a few hundred thousand years old.

VI. Ocean aging via salt influx:

Studies have determined estimated flow rates of salt into the ocean and the present salinity indicating an ocean age of a few hundred thousand years.

VII. Probability:

According to Hoyle (Sir Fred Hoyle, astronomer and odds maker, not the card shark), the required time for the "accidental" arrangement of the 200,000 proteins required for a living "thing" would be 1.5 trillion years; 300 times the 5 billion years that the earth has supposedly existed; 1000 times the 1.5 billion years that the earth has supposedly been cooled.

VIII. Formation of river deltas:

The formation of river deltas can be measured by typical sediment calculations. (See V above.) The calculation of the earth's age, based on this data shows that the earth could not possibly be over a few thousand years old.

IX. Earth's population:

Even considering the effects of local famines over the years, the current population suggests the age of the earth to be no more than a few thousand years.

Summary:

The only dating methods that suggest an earth of millions or billions of years are "radiometric methods." (This is the subject of other articles.) Most of the others indicate an age for the earth in the few thousands to few hundred thousand year range. The difference between the two is enormous! an error factor of 10,000 or even 1,000,000! It would be easy to see a 100% error (factor of two) or a factor of ten error. I will go as far as to say a factor of 100 in some cases may be legitimate. (Such as ocean sediments) However, one thing for sure, one of the two forms of dating methods is definitely WRONG! Which form?

In order for all of the methods above to be wrong, at least nine unrelated extremely large errors would have to exist. These errors would have to range from a factor of 100 to 1,000,000! So, although it is extremely likely that any of the dating methods above may have seriously wrong assumptions, it is highly unlikely that they could all have errors in the 100 to 1,000,000 range!

On the other hand, in order for the radiometric methods to be all wrong requires only one common error; such as the initial values are wrong, or the rate of change is not constant (for any one of several reasons).

The decision as to which scenario is the most likely - is up to you.

X. "But what about the stars?" You say:

Evolutionists always want to hang their hat on this one. The argument goes like this, "If a star is a billion light years away, then it must have taken a billion years for the light to reach the earth." "WRONG!" Einstein's theory of relativity disagrees. A "light year" is a unit of measurement for distance, not time! We measure distance in feet, inches, miles, etc., NOT days, months or years. When the effects of general relativity are considered, the position of stars and galaxies could just as easily suggest a very young earth!

Happy Birthday, Mother Earth! If evolutionists have their way, you'll be a trillion years old before you know it!

References:

Barnes, T. G., Young Age for the Moon and Earth (ICR)
Berg, O., FCS discussion of Oct. 89, and Jan. 90
Gentry, R. V., Annual Review of Nuclear Science
Humphreys, D.R., Starlight and Time
ICR Video Tape, Age of the Earth
Morris, H., The Defender Bible
Oller, J. W., Not According to Hoyle (ICR)
Stoner, P. W., Science Speaks