

Evolutionists very many times quote very unscientific dates. Why? It is a sign of their deception.

When looking at many articles from evolutionists and those that believe in billions of years, you will see that many dates are quoted without any error ranges. To see this for yourself, just enter the following into google, where xxx can be any number.

“million years ago” xxx
Or “million years old” xxx

Some dates to try: 518, 1.45, 539, 113, 252, 19, 84, 2.6, 890, 260, 299, 510, 210, 160, 460, 139, 247, 313, 108, 104, 103, 112, 116, 129, 133, 193, 232, 41, 183, 122, 213, 207, and 301. And other number will give more results.

And even if an error range is given, there are no calculations to substantiate the error range given. The problem is that when giving any scientific value derived from any measurement, the error range must also be provided else it is not a scientific value. This is from high school science labs in chemistry, physics and biology and repeated in college. A lab report that does not do this would probably receive a failing grade. If some value is derived from the quantity being measured through some set of equations, then the error ranges must also be carried through with the equations. If there are multiple measured values, each will then contribute to the final error range, each potentially with its own set of equation. Even some constants are actually from measured values and may contribute to the final error range. Another approach would be to do a statistical analysis of the values and report an error range based on that.

Now some articles will use phrases such as “about ...” or “some ...” or “roughly ...” or “starting ...” or “... to ...”. These articles are not giving an exact age as the phrase certainly indicates. But they still use exact numbers with no error ranges and without a calculation as to where the numbers come from.

So why is there no error range? And where are the calculations to determine the error range?

So, these values are not scientific at all. **All publications containing such should be retracted. And no publication should be allowed that does not meet this simple scientific standard.** Of course, that would be a major problem for evolution and billions of years, because the real error ranges are extremely large. Things that come from known historical events are dated as very old, some over billions of years old. That means that the error range is +- 100% of the measured value. So, these dates would include about 4500 years ago for things from the flood and about 6000 years ago for things from the 6-day creation. And in measuring the age of the same things, the dating methods disagree with each other widely. Things that are supposedly ancient are not C-14 dead and are therefore not ancient. And since the only way to calibrate the dating

technique is to use things of a known age has proved to be a complete failure, there is no dating technique that can be used for evolution and billions of years. Projection outside the measured and observed range is pseudo-science.

So why do they report these exact dates which is known to be completely unscientific? First consider that the source of these reported dates is from scientists who are using the no God assumption. They are therefore unaware that their long age dates are false. They do not consider the effects from 6-day creation, the curse due to the fall from Adam and Eve's sin, or the effects of what God did during the flood. They do not understand these will cause systematic errors in these dating techniques. So, the error ranges are inaccurate, as are the error range calculations. Then others use this information to make reports to a larger audience. Now those that do this may not just copy and paste the reported error ranges. This they may consider not important or that their audience would consider the article cluttered with trivial information. They may even feel that their audience would understand these error ranges. I believe that almost all of their audiences would understand them perfectly. Many have claimed that those that prepare these articles do not know what they are doing or are not trained in science. I also do not believe that at all. Almost all if not all are professional journalists who understand the content that they are working with. But they may leave out a word like "about" and they may not include the error ranges. And it is doubtful they will include the error calculations. So, a source paper may have "about 388 million years ago" will be changed to "388 million years ago". And a source paper that has 388 +/- 20 millions of years ago will be reported as 388 million years ago.

So, the deception ends up being propagated worldwide and many believe that the "science" of dating things is just so exact, due to this. But all dates should be reported with very large error ranges (+/- 100%). And that becomes a true disaster for the house of cards that evolution and billions of years rests on. For example, if the date for a species that descended from another species overlaps with the ancestor, which they would, then how can anyone claim that one species descended from another? They can't claim that. But that claim is needed because the descent tree of supposed new features requires it. And if the date for a species that descended from another species overlaps with the ancestor species, which it would, how can someone claim that the supposed ancestor species is in an older, lower rock layer? They can't claim that. See how the house of cards collapses. Also note that the accumulation of DNA mutation error rates for all species, especially the mitochondrial DNA mutations error rates, proves that all species, the earth, the earth's surface, all fossils and all rock layers are less than 10,000 years old. This all dating of things beyond 10,000 years old are false and by very large amount.

Now there is an even deeper deception than scientists trying to line up all their dating on some supposed timeline. From the Bible it is known that Satan deceives the whole world. So, the exact dating is Satan mocking all those that are supposedly scientific to use exact dates which are not scientific at all. The movie "Inherit the Wind" was a

propaganda piece based on a play written Jerome Lawrence and Robert Lee who wrote the play specifically as a propaganda piece. At the end of the movie, the press only wants to hear from the evolutionists as they now have the microphone. But the writers themselves were completely deceived by Satan because Satan now had the microphone. Both have died and went on to judgment.

All publications containing such unscientific dates should be retracted. And no publication should be allowed that does not meet this simple scientific standard.

This is to restore integrity in science in this area of knowledge. And of course, all things supposedly over 6000 years old should be C-14 tested.

Here are some links which give exact dates. There are many more.

<https://www.psu.edu/news/research/story/paleonursery-offers-rare-detailed-glimpse-life-518-million-years-ago/>

<https://www.cnn.com/2022/08/23/us/dinosaur-tracks-discovered-texas-park/index.html>

<https://phys.org/news/2023-06-humans-evolutionary-butchered-million-years.html>

https://www.upi.com/Science_News/2018/12/13/Climate-change-also-wiped-out-life-on-Earth-252-million-years-ago/5791544714950/

<https://www.ndtv.com/science/scientists-find-worlds-oldest-fossil-gnat-from-247-million-years-ago-3877467>

<https://www.iflscience.com/mushrooms-evolved-to-become-psychedelic-67-million-years-ago-but-why-72393>

<https://polarjournal.ch/en/2021/07/29/first-animal-life-as-early-as-890-million-years-ago/>

<https://www.businessinsider.com/earth-tipped-over-84-million-years-ago-study-2021-6>

<https://www.universetoday.com/140856/a-supernova-2-6-million-years-ago-could-have-wiped-out-the-oceans-large-animals/>

<https://www.futurity.org/plants-land-ordovician-2466602/>

<https://www.kidsnews.com.au/animals/giant-sea-slayer-with-massive-jaw-ruled-ocean-170-million-years-ago/news-story/9e14f5f5da39bd53e37c26cb8d38ca0d>

<https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/these-large-flesh-eating-lampreys-lived-160-million-years-ago-180983182/>

<https://www.livescience.com/animals/extinct-species/edward-scissorhands-creature-that-lived-230-million-years-ago-discovered-in-brazil>

<https://www.sci.news/paleontology/cambrian-green-algae-12401.html>

<https://www.newsweek.com/moon-photo-tycho-crater-asteroid-108-million-years-radar-green-bank-observatory-1631460>

<https://www.iflscience.com/first-fossil-evidence-of-deep-sea-invertebrates-from-104-million-years-ago-70580>

<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/112-million-year-old-dinosaur-tracks-utah-damaged-construction-equipment-rcna22714>

<https://english.elpais.com/science-tech/2022-04-07/the-limping-dinosaur-who-roamed-spain-129-million-years-ago.html>

<https://bigthink.com/the-past/dinosaurs-social-behavior/>

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-11058371/Marine-animals-dating-183-million-years-ago-uneearthed-farmers-field-Gloucestershire.html>

<https://www.amnh.org/explore/news-blogs/research-posts/ancient-shark-carl-mehling>

<https://eartharchives.org/articles/a-broken-bone-is-newest-clue-in-evolutionary-transition-to-land/index.html>

<http://esciencenews.com/sources/science.daily/2010/09/14/frosty.times.dinosaurs.major.fall.temperature.137.million.years.ago.during.cretaceous.greenhouse>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sturddlefish>

<http://archives.news.yale.edu/v31.n12/story3.html>

<https://www.thearchaeologist.org/blog/fossilized-prehistoric-teeth-from-97-million-years-ago-could-rewrite-human-history>

<https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/menefeceratops-sealeyi-dinosaur-new-mexico>