

## ***RADIOMETRIC DATING REALITIES***

Pagan cultures since Nimrod at the tower of Babel have been evolutionary.<sup>1</sup> There are no significant exceptions, though the many cultural creation and Flood legends indicate that these peoples once had a dim memory of biblical truth.<sup>2</sup> **Over time, the fallenness of man caused the true history of the world to be forgotten, with an evolutionary story taking its place.** Fallen man's preference for falsehood (Prov. 14:12, 16:25) insured that this regression would happen.<sup>3</sup> The only way this fate is reversed is by the direct intervention of God in human affairs.<sup>4</sup>

Before the coming of Christ into the world, mankind had descended from a condition of greatness to a low state of scientific stagnation, poverty, servitude, and worldwide paganism -- including evolution. Only a small elite and wealthy class escaped poverty and servitude, but this was at the expense of the masses of poor people.

**The Bible itself confirms this gloomy condition of humanity as it existed 2000 years ago,** for "in the fullness of time" -- i.e., when the cup of human iniquity and degradation was full -- Christ came into the world (Gal. 4:4). True, the Roman culture of that time accomplished some great technological and military feats, but at the cost of the great majority of people being poor, illiterate, and in bondage to slave masters or to the state.

But physical servitude was not the only kind of bondage in the world of Jesus' time. There was also spiritual bondage and fear toward the polytheistic pantheons of deities supposedly ruling the world. **It was believed that these deities had caused the cosmos to evolve in much the same way envisioned by modern evolution.**<sup>5</sup> This means that -

### **MODERN EVOLUTION IS MOSTLY A REPLAY OF ANCIENT EVOLUTION**

Man was only an evolving animal, the universe began from a "cosmic egg" akin to the modern concept of the Big Bang,<sup>6</sup> eons later life came from the sea, and -- as in modern New Age evolution -- man was believed to be evolving into godhood. **In its basic concepts, modern evolution is hardly different from the origins concepts of the Romans and the Greeks.** It is also similar to the origins concepts of the Egyptians and Babylonians from whom the Greeks and Romans borrowed their philosophical beliefs.

**When Jesus founded the Church 2000 years ago (Matt. 16:18), this was the beginning of the end for ancient paganism and evolutionism.** Paganism and evolutionism became fringe movements for the next two millennia. With the advent of the 1700s and the approach of the end of the age, however, these fringe movements started regaining strength. In the 1800s, evolutionism and various sorts of ancient paganism were introduced publicly once again.<sup>7</sup> In the 1900s, these movements gained almost universal acceptance. **Modern evolution is therefore a revival of ancient paganism, and that this "revival" has already been in process for over two centuries.**

With this in mind, we now consider **the one person most responsible for bringing evolution into public**

**acceptance in the 1800s. His name was Charles Lyell (1797-1873).** He made geologic evolution appear superficially "scientific" so that by the end of the 1800s, virtually all educated people believed the earth had evolved geologically over eons of time, which was a return to the belief common in the ancient pagan world. Lyell also paved the way for Charles Darwin (1809-1882), since for biological evolution to be possible, there had to be a very long time available. A look at Lyell's reason for promoting geological evolution reveals -

### ***RADIOMETRIC DATING REALITY #1: AN ANTI-BIBLICAL AGENDA MOTIVATED THE EVOLUTIONARY CHRONOLOGY***

Though Lyell presented his geological evolution publicly as if it were a scientific concept, after his death, his private letters were published showing that --

#### **LYELL'S "HIDDEN AGENDA" HAD BEEN TO DISCREDIT THE BIBLE**

Lyell spoke of having driven the Flood "out of the Mosaic record."<sup>8</sup> By this Lyell meant that **he intended to turn the events described in Genesis into objects of ridicule, so that Bible readers would consider the genealogies of Genesis irrelevant.** Another time he rejoiced about his circle of friends that, "They see at last the mischief and scandal brought on them by Mosaic systems," i.e., the genealogies recorded by Moses in Genesis. This would "free the science from Moses ..."<sup>9</sup> In opposing the Biblical chronology,

#### **LYELL WAS CONSCIOUSLY AWARE THAT HE PAVED THE WAY FOR DARWIN**

He and Darwin were contemporaries, with Lyell being somewhat older. When young, Lyell had been on the lookout for a person like Darwin who would extend Lyell's geological evolution into biology. When Darwin came on the scene, Lyell supported him by every means available. **Later in life, Lyell wrote of his success in smoothing the path for Darwin:** "I had certainly prepared the way in this country, in six editions of my work ... for the reception of Darwin's gradual and insensible evolution ..."<sup>10</sup> In working out his agenda, **Lyell had a personal policy of avoiding the appearance of forcing his ideas on others.** He believed that his agenda against the Bible would be more successful if -

#### **ATTACKS ON THE BIBLE WERE ONLY INDIRECT**

For example, regarding biological evolution, "Lyell thought that new species were taking the place of old ones, but he was not always definite about it. 'He kept [the idea] almost invisible, because he could not refer to any particle of a fact which would give any indication of how a species could be "created" by natural law. He wanted his readers to gather such an idea, but he wanted to avoid the scientific odium of proposing it as a part of science'. "<sup>11</sup>

Perceiving biological evolution as less of a certainty than geological evolution, **Lyell left to Darwin the task of**

**making biological evolution believable to the public.**

Another reason Lyell was reticent about his belief in biological evolution was that –

**LYELL WAS TRAINED AS A LAWYER, NOT A SCIENTIST**

Accordingly, **Lyell used his legal training to cleverly insinuate his beliefs into people's minds without stating his beliefs bluntly.** "[Lyell] expressed his belief in [evolution], but he more or less [implied] it in his books so as not to arouse opposition. 'In regard to the origination of new species, I am very glad to find that you think it probable that it may be carried on through the intervention of intermediate causes. I left this rather to be inferred, not thinking it worthwhile to offend a certain class of persons by embodying in words what could only be a speculation'."<sup>12</sup> In another letter, Lyell explained that -

**HIS AGENDA WAS TO CONVERT PEOPLE TO EVOLUTION, NOT TO OFFEND THEM**

"Lyell ... explained the purpose of his tendency to conceal his ultimate goals: 'If we don't irritate, which I fear that we may ... we shall carry all with us. If you don't triumph over them, but compliment the liberality and candour of the present age, the bishops and enlightened saints will join us in despising both the ancient and modern physico-theologians'."<sup>13</sup> In other words, **Lyell succeeded in flattering eminent men of science and religion, that by accepting his views on evolution, they were keeping up with the times.** He made them feel that continuing to accept the Bible was to be ignorant and backward. Further,

**LYELL LOOKED ON THOSE WHO DID NOT AGREE WITH HIM AS "STUPID"**

**Lyell was therefore a forerunner of modern evolutionists and humanists who regard Bible believers as unlearned.** He wrote, "I was very sensitive of the good opinion of others ... I never confessed to myself to myself that I was wrong, but always reasoned myself into a belief that the generality of people were too stupid to comprehend the interest of [my] pursuits . ..."<sup>14</sup>

We can now see that Lyell, the most influential forerunner of Darwin, (1) had a hidden agenda to discredit the Bible, and (2) keenly desired to replace the biblical record of origins with evolution. How would Lyell carry out his agenda? Consistent with his habit of refusing publicly to reveal his actual motivations,

**LYELL WROTE A WORK ON GEOLOGY DESIGNED TO SUBSTITUTE GEOLOGIC EVOLUTION FOR THE BIBLE**

**He never ridiculed the Bible or Moses directly.** Instead, as he wrote, "I conceived the idea five or six years ago, that if ever the Mosaic chronology could be set down [overthrown]

without giving offence, it would be in an historical sketch [i.e., in a book about 'historical geology']. ..."<sup>15</sup> With the publication of his three-volume *Principles of Geology* published during 1830-1833, Lyell succeeded beyond his wildest dreams.

As already noted, Lyell paved the way for Darwin to popularize biological evolution. Indeed, within Lyell's lifetime, and well before Darwin had died, the belief was nearly universal, as one geology text from 1873 pointed out, that the earth's crust was some 100 million years old.<sup>16</sup> If the crust were this old, the earth itself must have begun evolving eons earlier. **Thus by 1873 the biblical chronology had been totally displaced by an evolutionary one.**

Darwin was still living when this book was published, and so was Lyell. Hardly more than a decade had passed since the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, yet the evolutionary story of biology was rapidly accepted because of the preparatory work of Lyell. The 1873 geology text has the same evolutionary story as modern ones, but with lots of biblical allusions included. There were two reasons for including references to the Bible: (1) biblical thinking lingered on and would not be totally displaced for awhile; (2) it was deemed advisable to include some biblical allusions to soften the impact of the evolutionary story. By giving appearances that the evolutionary view was not such a wrenching change, the public would be led to embrace evolution as a more "modern" understanding of the Bible. How does radiometric dating fit into all this? The answer is -

**RADIOMETRIC DATING REALITY #2: EVOLUTIONISTS "KNEW" THE EARTH MUST BE OLD BEFORE RADIOMETRIC DATING WAS EVER DONE**

This is no secret. Many evolutionists have commented on this reality. One wrote, "The basic [evolutionary] time scale has remained unchanged since 1879."<sup>17</sup> This was nearly twenty years before the discovery of radioactivity in 1896, **and some 30 years before the first radiometric dating measurement was carried out.** Yet radiometric dating is touted today as the method by which we "know" that the earth is old.

Indeed, Arthur Holmes, one of the most influential developers of modern radiometric methods, wrote that until radiometric dating no one knew the age of the earth. He said, "Until the discovery of radioactivity, geologists were in the same position as a historian who knew, for example, that the Roman invasion of Britain was followed by the Norman conquest and that both these events occurred before the Battle of Waterloo, but who could not find any record of the dates of these or any other of the great events of history."<sup>18</sup> This claim is simply false, since -

**EVOLUTIONISTS THOUGHT THEY KNEW HOW OLD THE EARTH WAS BEFORE THE FIRST RADIOMETRIC TEST WAS EVER DONE!**

As one geologist put it, "I wonder how many of us realize that the time scale was frozen in essentially its present form by

1840."<sup>19</sup> **This was almost half a century before the first radiometric test.**

What did radiometric dating show that evolutionists did not already believe they knew? The answer is *nothing!* However, radiometric dating did provide a seemingly scientific rationale for the long chronology of evolution. **But this long chronology was solidly established by Charles Lyell without any appeal to radiometric dating.** This means that –

**RADIOMETRIC DATING HAS BEEN EXPLOITED TO "PROVE" THE OLD AGES WHICH EVOLUTIONISTS HAD ALREADY BELIEVED**

In other words, evolutionists already knew what they believed before radiometric dating ever came along. One of the foremost evolutionary geologists of a generation ago wrote: "By the years 1830-1833, when the three volumes of Charles Lyell's great classic *Principles of Geology* were published, the system of sequential or relative dating was well established."<sup>20</sup>

**Radiometric dating added nothing significant to this system except a show of scientific respectability -- yet this was a system popularized for the purpose of discrediting the Word of God, as Charles Lyell's letters clearly state.**

How credible is radiometric dating? The reality is that the methods of radiometric dating are so imprecise that any radiometric test produces a wide "shotgun" scatter of apparent "dates." The dates selected as valid are the ones agreeing with preconceived notions of the age being measured. In other words, we have -

**RADIOMETRIC DATING REALITY #3:  
RADIOMETRIC "DATES" ARE CHOSEN TO FIT  
PRECONCEIVED NOTIONS**

**This means that the dates "measured" by radiometric methods are not independent measurements.** They are always tied back to evolutionary chronology. It is therefore hardly surprising that radiometric dating consistently appears to confirm evolution. As unscientific as this is, it is a situation that has been acknowledged time and again in books and journal articles, as in the following:

- "The published dating figures *always* conform to preconceived dates and never contradict those dates. If all the rejected dates were retrieved from the waste basket and added to the published dates, the combined results would show that the dates produced are the scatter that one would expect by chance alone [emphasis in original]."<sup>21</sup>
- There is a concentration of accepted radiometric dates around the values preconceived as being correct, for such "figures are obtained by omitting, with no objective reason, the much broader deviations."<sup>22</sup>
- "In general, dates in the 'correct ball park' are assumed to be correct and are published, but those in disagreement with other data are seldom published ..."<sup>23</sup>
- "Many age determinations which do not agree with currently accepted time scales are simply rejected as wrong ..."<sup>24</sup>

- "In the majority of cases the ages are off and the [discrepant] data disappear in a lab-datafile."<sup>25</sup>

**Christians who try to harmonize biblical chronology with evolutionary dates should consider the fact that Charles Lyell realized there was no such harmony.** There is no basis either in Scripture or in science for a Christian to accept any system of evolutionary dates, especially considering that from the start the evolutionary system was devised to discredit the Word of God which Christians claim to believe.<sup>26</sup>

**References**

- 1 H.M. Morris, *The Long War Against God*, Baker, 1985, pp. 233-244.
- 2 J. Henry, "Legends of the Creation, Fall and Babel," <creationconcepts .org>, 2006; J. Henry, "More Legends of the Creation, Flood and Babel," <creationconcepts.org>, 2006.
- 3 J. Henry, "The Rise of the New Scientific Priesthood," <creation concepts .org>, 2006.
- 4 J. Henry, "Christianity and the Rise of Modern Science," <creation concepts.org>, 2006.
- 5 The evolutionary concepts of antiquity were rooted ultimately in Nimrod's rebellion against the Creator at Babel and continue to be reflected in extant religious systems such as Hinduism which survive from ancient times (J. Henry, "Ye Shall Be As Gods: The Modern Search for Extraterrestrial Life," <creationconcepts.org>, 1999).
- 6 C. Sagan, *Cosmos*, Random House, 1980, pp. 257-258.
- 7 J. Henry, "Charles Darwin and the *Origin of Species*: Dispelling Fourteen Myths About Darwin," <creationconcepts.org>, 2002.
- 8 K.M. Lyell, *Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, John Murray, London, 1881, Vol. 1, p. 253. This is a two volume set that is in the public domain, but it may not readily available because of its age. A more accessible, recent book discussing the same information is Robert T. Clark and James D. Bales, *Why Scientists Accept Evolution*, Baker, 1966, p. 19.
- 9 Lyell, Vol. 1, p. 268; see also Clark and Bales, p. 19. "... Lyell was motivated primarily by hatred of the Bible ..." (Morris, p. 99).
- 10 Lyell, Vol. 2, pp. 436-437; see also Clark and Bales, p. 22.
- 11 Clark and Bales, pp. 22-23, citing Henshaw Ward, *Charles Darwin and the Theory of Evolution*, The New Home Library, 1943, p. 436.
- 12 Clark and Bales, p. 25, quoting Lyell, Vol. 1, p. 467.
- 13 Clark and Bales, p. 24, quoting Lyell, Vol. 1, p. 271.
- 14 Lyell, Vol. 1, p. 17; see also Clark and Bales, pp. 22-23. It should not be inferred that Lyell was publicly rude or tactless toward those with whom he disagreed. **Lyell's reputation was that he was a personable and pleasant conversationalist, and he expressed his low opinion of the Bible only in private correspondence to trusted**

**colleagues.** There are lessons here: (1) one gets his message across more effectively by being "nice"; and (2) a person's charisma is no guide to the truth of what he teaches. Even the Bible teaches that the Christian message is conveyed most effectively as the world sees that Christians love one another (John 13:35).

**15** Lyell, Vol. 1, p. 271; see also Clark and Bales, p. 24.

**16** J.W. Dawson, *The Story of the Earth and Man*, Harper, 1873, p. 14.

**17** Stephen Rowland, "A New Shirt for Carl," *Science* 83, Vol. 4 no. 5, May 1983, p. 80.

**18** Arthur Holmes, *Principles of Physical Geology*, Ronald Press, 1965, p. 346; in Harold S. Slusher, *Critique of Radiometric Dating*, ICR, 1981, p. 7.

**19** Edmund M. Speiker, "Mountain-Building and the Nature of the Geologic Time Scale," *Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists*, Vol. 40, August 1956, p. 1803.

**20** George Gaylord Simpson, *Fossils and the History of the Earth*, Scientific American Library, 1983, p. 58.

**21** Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, Park Street Press, 1997, p. 51.

**22** J.B. Waterhouse, "Chronologic, Ecologic, and Evolutionary Significance of the Phylum Brachiopoda," in Erle G. Kauffman and

Joseph E. Hazel (editors), *Concepts and Methods of Biostratigraphy*, Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, 1979, p. 499.

**23** Richard L. Mauger, "K-Ar Ages of Biotites from Tuffs in Eocene Rocks of the Green River, Washakiw and Uinta Basins," *Contributions to Geology, Wyoming University*. Vol. 15 no. 1, 1977, p. 37.

**24** Chris Paul, *The Natural History of Fossils*, Holmes and Meier, 1980, p. 184.

**25** E. Jagoutz, "Isotopic Systematics of Metamorphic Rocks," in M.A. Lanphere, G.B. Dalrymple, and B.D. Turrin (editors), *Abstracts of the Eighth International Conference on Geochronology, Cosmochronology, and Isotope Geology*, Circular 1107, U.S. Geological Survey, 1994, p. 156.

**26** For a discussion of biblical chronology, see J. Henry, "What Is the Age of the Universe?", <creationconcepts.org>, 2001. For a refutation of evolutionary chronology, see J. Henry, "Critique of Progressive Creationism, Part 1," <creationconcepts.org>, 2005; J. Henry, "A Critique of Progressive Creationism in the Writings of Hugh Ross," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 43 no. 1, June 2006, pp. 16-24; and J. Henry, "An Old Age for the Earth Is the Heart of Evolution," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 40, December 2003, pp. 164-172..