

**Creation Science Evangelism Rebuttal
Wrong Assumptions Yield Wrong
Answers**



By Greg Neyman
© Old Earth Ministries (Answers In Creation)

First Published 21 March 2006
Answers In Creation Website

One of the featured articles in the geology section of Kent Hovind's website, Creation Science Evangelism, talks about the assumptions within radiometric dating.¹ This article is written by Bruce Malone. It is a very general article, giving no valid points against radiometric dating.

This argument uses a simple sight-picture, to explain how the assumptions may be corrupt. It is effective in conveying the idea to anyone willing to swallow this line without investigating it further, which is what most young earth creationists will do.

As Malone points out, there are assumptions within radiometric dating. However, these assumptions are based on some very valid data points, and through the use of comparative testing, they have proved in the long run to be good assumptions. Take the starting point for the dating of a rock...the amount of radioactive material in the sample. When one rock is dated, a date is given based on this assumption. When a rock from another layer is dated, say a younger layer (it lies stratigraphically on top of the other rock), it dates younger, based on the same assumptions. These two samples validate each other. No, the dates are not perfect. However, now multiply this simple example by millions of times (radiometric dating has been performed millions of times), and the results can be compared to each other, and the initial assumptions can therefore be tested. In the end, these initial assumptions prove to be reliable.

Malone makes an absurd statement in his conclusion. He says "There are actually very few dating methods which seem to indicate that the earth is extremely old. In the other hand there are many dating methods which indicate that the earth is quite young." Given the wealth of radiometric and astronomical data which supports an old earth (and the lack of any of it supporting a young earth), his statement is a complete lie (I don't use this term often). He refers to many dating methods what indicate a young earth. I've never seen one...although there could be two. First, Ussher's chronology, and second, the young earth interpretation of the Genesis account. Neither can be considered a "scientific dating method."

¹ Wrong Assumptions Yield Wrong Answers, by Bruce Malone. Posted on the Creation Science Evangelism website at <http://www.drdino.com/articles.php?spec=41>