









































































































**Attack G.2: "This hasn't been peer-reviewed!"**

**Criticism:** "If even published in journals, this is not validated science."

**👍 REBUTTAL:**

"Peer review is valuable but not infallible:

1. Many paradigm shifts were initially rejected by peer review (continental drift, heliocentrism)
2. Peer review is gate-kept by those invested in current paradigms
3. We've sought review from independent analytical systems (AI) - all confirmed mathematical validity

We welcome peer review and have published openly (Zenodo [1]) inviting verification. If our mathematics are wrong, show us where. If our data are invalid, specify which. If our logic is flawed, identify the error.

We provide all equations, data, and methodology for independent replication. That IS the scientific method - testability, not gate-keeping."

**Attack G.3: "Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence!"**

**Criticism:** "You're overturning 120 years of science - you need overwhelming proof."

**👍 REBUTTAL:**

"We HAVE extraordinary evidence:

1. 15 independent systems.
2. All converge to same timescale ( $P < 10^{-8}$  for random convergence)
3. 100% accuracy achieved (conventional methods achieve <1% at deep time)
4. Falsification of alternative ( $r_0 < 0$  at billions of years - impossible)
5. Prediction confirmed (convergence to Genesis 1 chronology)

What more evidence is needed? We have mathematical proof (convergence), empirical validation (100% accuracy), falsification of alternative (negative  $r_0$ ), and predictive power (matches Scripture).

The question is not whether we have extraordinary evidence - we do. The question is whether paradigm gate-keepers will honestly examine it."

This is not gaps reasoning; it's inference to best explanation. The data fit designed creation better than gradualistic evolution."

### **3. Addressing Isochron Dating Methodology**

Critical Acknowledgment: Modern geochronology does not universally assume  $r_0 = 0$ . Isochron methods were specifically developed to avoid this assumption.

#### **Why This Matters for Our Framework**

The existence of isochron methods appears to invalidate our central criticism of the  $r_0 = 0$  assumption. However, some important considerations remain :

#### **Isochron Methods Still Embed Deep-Time Assumptions**

While isochrons don't assume  $r_0 = 0$ , they DO assume:

- Closed system behavior for millions/billions of years (no gain/loss of parent or daughter isotopes except by decay)
- Initial homogeneity (all samples started with same  $r_0$  at time zero)

Our critical question: Are these assumptions still valid?

Creational Code interpretation: All systems contain non-zero  $r_0$  established at creation, not decay products from deep time.

#### **Integration with Creational Code Framework**

Despite the challenge posed by isochrons, the Creational Code framework still explains:

- ✓ Why simple  $r_0 = 0$  models fail (producing negative initial conditions)
- ✓ Why recent volcanic rocks contain "excess argon" (inherited  $r_0$ )
- ✓ Why soft tissue persists in fossils (young burial age)
- ✓ Why multiple systems converge to short timescales (true elapsed time)

The isochron challenge does not invalidate these observations. It requires developing more sophisticated understanding of how primordial isotopic ratios relate to age determination.

### "Response to Expected Criticisms - Final Word"

"This chapter has systematically addressed the strongest objections likely to be raised against the Creational Code System. We have shown that:

1. Each criticism either misunderstands our methodology, relies on circular reasoning within the conventional paradigm, or invokes ad hoc mechanisms to save deep time
2. Our framework consistently provides simpler, more elegant explanations that achieve higher accuracy (99.9-100%) without requiring adjustable parameters or special pleading
3. The convergence of 15 independent systems to Genesis chronology is statistically overwhelming - far exceeding the evidentiary standard applied to conventional geochronology

We do not claim to have answered every possible question. Science advances through hypothesis testing, and we invite rigorous examination of our work. However, the burden of proof has shifted: Conventional geochronology must now explain why:

- $r_0 = 0$  produces mathematically impossible results (negative initial conditions)
- $r_0 \neq 0$  achieves 100% accuracy across multiple independent systems
- All corrected systems converge to the same sub-week timeframe matching Genesis

Until these questions are answered, the Creational Code System stands as the superior framework - mathematically rigorous, empirically validated, and logically consistent with both physical data and revealed truth. We have done our part in presenting the evidence. Now we await honest engagement with the mathematics, not dismissal based on paradigm preference."

Dr Salib Gad



# Philosophy of The Scientific Criticism




Chart 8 : Showing the Philosophy for Scientific Criticism

## Chapter 8: Author's Final Words

### The Thesis of Literal Chronology and Universal Synchronization

If we assume, in reality, that the :

True Age of the Earth = Age of Man on Earth + Actual Creation Time

And if we also assume that the Actual Creation Time is 6 literal days, and not 6 geological ages, then this implies the following:

The first day of Creation was completed in just one day for the entire non-living universe (excluding living beings like fish, birds, animals, and man). This was followed by 5 more literal days for the creation of the remaining living beings, resulting in a Total Creation Time of 6 literal days.

### The Core Equation and Conclusion:

True Age of the Earth =

Age of Man on Earth + Actual Creation Time (6 Literal Days)

Given that we have already succeeded in validating the Universal Code Equation (r0), demonstrating that creation occurred in the first day, it is not impossible that the rest of the creation time equals  $1 + 5 = 6$  literal days.

Therefore, if we have successfully shown that through the Animal Code was created literally on the Sixth Day, then the equation must be applicable—such that the r0 value is 100% at Day 6 for this creation.

In this scenario, our common knowledge/ancient civilizations on earth that the generally accepted Age of Man on Earth is approximately 6,000–7,000 years :

True Age of the Earth  $\approx$  (6,000 - 7,000 years) + 6 literal days

This places the True Age of the Earth at approximate figure.

**N.B.** It's worth-mentioning to inform the reader/researcher/scientist, that the r0 equation used in this book for the concept of complete synchronization using "creational code system", can be applied also to other several systems (not mentioned in this book), such as : Carbonates , Silicates , Solar system, Aqueous system , Lunar system, ... etc

## **Message to the Scientific Community:**

"In the Event of Rejection - What Scientific Integrity Requires"

To our colleagues in the global scientific community :

This research has presented mathematical evidence across 15 independent physical systems that challenges conventional geochronological assumptions maintained for 120 years.

We understand that paradigm shifts provoke resistance - this is natural and healthy in science. However, if you choose to reject the Creational Code System, scientific integrity demands more than philosophical dismissal or appeal to consensus. It requires rigorous mathematical rebuttal.

This message outlines the specific scientific obligations that rejection entails. We issue these not as ultimatums but as invitations to honest engagement with the mathematics. Science advances through rigorous testing of competing hypotheses, not through gatekeeping based on paradigm preference.

### **1. The Mathematical Impossibility you must resolve:**

The Core Problem: Negative Initial Conditions

Our analysis demonstrates that conventional chronology (assuming  $r_0 = 0$  or  $r_0 \approx 0$ ) produces mathematically impossible results when tested across multiple systems (Chapter 2 - 5).

The Mathematical Challenge:

A negative initial value ( $r_0 < 0$ ) is physically meaningless:

- Cannot have negative isotopic ratios in minerals

Your Scientific Obligation:

If you reject our  $r_0 \neq 0$  framework, you must mathematically explain how these systems could start with negative quantities and accumulate to current positive values. This is not philosophical debate - it is mathematical contradiction that demands resolution.

Three Options:

1. Accept that  $r_0 < 0$  falsifies conventional chronology
2. Demonstrate mathematical Equation errors in our calculations
3. Provide alternative explanation for negative initial conditions

## 2. The Synchronization Anomaly you must address

The Convergence Problem:

Our analysis reveals that 15 independent systems - spanning nuclear physics, and paleontology - all achieve maximum accuracy (99.9-100%) at timeframes between 1 day and 6 days.

The Statistical Challenge:

The probability "P" of 15 systems with fundamentally different physics randomly converging to the same sub-week timeframe is:

$P < 10^{-8}$  (statistically impossible)

Your Scientific Obligation:

If you reject this convergence as evidence for synchronized creation, you must provide one of the following :

Option A: Explain the Convergence

Demonstrate mathematically why 15 systems with different:

- Physical mechanisms (decay vs. accumulation vs. loss)
- Time constants ( $10^{-12}$  to  $10^{-4}$  yr<sup>-1</sup>)
- Chemical/physical contexts (crystalline, biological)

... would ALL independently point to the same narrow temporal window by pure coincidence.

Calculate the probability and show your work.

Option B: Refute Each System Individually

Provide 15 separate, robust explanations for why each system fails at conventional timescales:

1. Why do 12 isotopic systems require  $r_0$  values representing 99.9% of measured ratios?
2. Why does dinosaur fossil collagen/protein dating achieve 100% accuracy at 0.01643 day?

Each explanation must be:

- Mathematically rigorous (quantitative, not qualitative)
- Physically plausible (no violation of conservation laws)
- Independently testable (falsifiable predictions)
- Free from circular reasoning (cannot assume deep time to prove deep time)

Ad hoc mechanisms ("excess argon," "steady-state equilibrium," "iron cross-linking,"... etc.) invoked separately for each anomaly constitute special pleading, not scientific explanation.

### Option C: Demonstrate Non-Synchronization

Prove mathematically that the apparent convergence is artifact or error:

- Show calculation errors in our convergence analysis
- Demonstrate that systems actually converge to different timescales
- Explain why our statistical analysis is flawed

Show your work with explicit calculations.

### 3. The Assumption you must defend or abandon

The  $r_0 = 0$  Assumption :

For 120 years, geochronology has assumed initial daughter isotope concentration equals zero (or negligibly small). This assumption has never been independently validated. It is mathematical convenience, not empirical fact.

Your Scientific Obligation:

If you maintain  $r_0 \approx 0$  is valid, you must provide one of the following:

#### Option A: Empirical Validation

Demonstrate through independent observation (not circular reasoning from radiometric ages) that :

- Rocks crystallize with zero daughter isotopes

Question: How do you measure initial conditions of systems formed billions of years ago without assuming the age you're trying to prove?

#### Option B: Theoretical Justification

Provide physical mechanism requiring  $r_0 = 0$ :

- Why must daughter isotopes be absent at crystallization?
- What law of physics mandates zero initial concentration?

- Why is  $r_0 \neq 0$  physically impossible?

We are unaware of any such law. If one exists, specify it.

Option C: Acknowledge  $r_0 \neq 0$

Accept that initial conditions were non-zero and incorporate  $r_0$  into conventional equations as we have done. Then test which timescale achieves optimal accuracy.

Our prediction: You will discover the same convergence we did.

#### **4. Three proposed pathways to resolution**

If you reject our framework, scientific integrity requires choosing one of these paths:

##### **SOLUTION 1: Demonstrate Variable Rates**

The Claim: Decay constants, accumulation rates, or loss rates were different in the past.

Your Obligation:

- Provide physical mechanism for rate change
- Show empirical evidence (not theoretical speculation)
- Explain why rates changed simultaneously across all 15 systems to produce apparent synchronization
- Specify when rates changed and by what factor
- Demonstrate this resolves  $r_0 < 0$  problem without introducing new contradictions

Show your calculations.

##### **SOLUTION 2: Propose Modified Physics**

The Claim: Conservation laws or physical constants were different in early Earth history.

Your Obligation:

- Specify which laws were violated and when
- Provide mechanism for transition to current physics

- Explain why this doesn't disrupt all of geology, cosmology, and physics
- Address why this isn't ad hoc (invoked solely to save deep time)

### SOLUTION 3: Accept Non-Zero Initial Conditions

The Acknowledgment: Initial conditions ( $r_0$ ) were non-zero by necessity (chemical stability, physical equilibrium).

Your Path:

- Incorporate  $r_0 \neq 0$  into conventional equations (as we have done)
- Test which timescale achieves maximum accuracy
- Follow the mathematics wherever it leads
- Accept results even if they challenge existing paradigms

This is the path of scientific integrity.

### 5. Two areas remain incompletely addressed in this work:

- (1) Detailed quantitative engagement with meteorite isochron &
- (2) Bayesian model comparison with justified likelihood ratios.

We intentionally leave these two categories to the broader scientific community. The foundation is established.

If this framework fails, demonstrate mathematically where and why

- If meteorite isochrons falsify the hypothesis, show quantitatively how  $r_0 \neq 0$  cannot explain concordant extraterrestrial ages
- If the statistical analysis is flawed, specify the error and provide corrected calculations

We seek truth, not vindication. If this framework is correct, collaborative refinement will strengthen it. If it is flawed, rigorous critique will expose the errors.

The central question remains: Do non-zero initial conditions ( $r_0 \neq 0$ ), when properly incorporated into geochronological calculations, favor timescales of thousands rather than billions of years?

The  $r_0$  equation speaks mathematically. The 15-system convergence speaks statistically. The validation on known-age samples speaks empirically.

Now we await the scientific community's response: honest engagement with the mathematics, not dismissal based on paradigm preference.

Whether this work represents paradigm-shifting insight or ..... only transparent scientific discourse can determine. We have presented the hypothesis. Let the Science speak.

---

Our Sincere Request:

We seek truth through rigorous analysis. We will gratefully acknowledge corrections.

Thomas K. demonstrated that paradigm shifts face enormous resistance not because evidence is lacking but because paradigms are defended culturally, professionally, and philosophically.

We understand this resistance. We experienced it in presenting this work. But science, at its best, follows evidence over comfort. Mathematics does not care about careers, consensus, or cultural preferences. It reveals truth impartially.

We have presented the mathematics. 15 independent systems point to the same conclusion through quantitative analysis. You may dislike the conclusion. You may find it theologically uncomfortable or professionally inconvenient. But discomfort is not refutation.

The question before you is simple:

Will you engage the mathematics honestly, or will you dismiss it philosophically?

Will you provide quantitative rebuttal, or qualitative rejection?

Will you follow evidence wherever it leads, or protect paradigms regardless of contradictions?

The choice is yours. Science is watching.

We will publish all rebuttals received and our replies, ensuring transparent scientific feedback.

---

*"What's impossible for humans is not impossible for **God**, who has the unlimited power to do anything.*

***HE** is the one who created all things with **His WORD** of power, for **HE** is the only Creator, blessed be **His NAME** forever, Amen".*



---

## Acknowledgment

The author acknowledges the help of the Artificial Intelligence models "Claude" , "Gemini" and "chat-GPT" for the valuable assistance in performing the computational mathematical analyses , gathering the data from all-over the net and websites and also for organizing the methodological structures that facilitated the arrival at these final conclusions.

## References

[1] Dr Salib Gad. *The theory of the existence of a "crystalline code" at creation is distinctive for each element / compound / rock to maintain its chemical and physical stability in nature , so that  $r_0$  is not equal to zero.* Zenodo. 2016 (1-4). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17453914>

[2] Faure, G & Mensing, T. M. (2005). *(Isotopes: Principles and Applications* .3rd ed. John Wiley & Sons.

<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1769865>

[3] Dickin, A. P. (2005). *(Radiogenic Isotope Geology* .Cambridge University Press.

[https://books.google.com.eg/books?hl=en&lr=&id=vDhFDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR17&dq=Dickin,+A.+P.+\(2005\).+Radiogenic+Isotope+Geology.+Cambridge+University+Press.&ots=LLn-S\\_Unp9&sig=JfgoTfC97-b4S4tigSelChAnilM&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Dickin%2C%20A.%20P.%20\(2005\).%20Radiogenic%20Isotope%20Geology.%20Cambridge%20University%20Press.&f=false](https://books.google.com.eg/books?hl=en&lr=&id=vDhFDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR17&dq=Dickin,+A.+P.+(2005).+Radiogenic+Isotope+Geology.+Cambridge+University+Press.&ots=LLn-S_Unp9&sig=JfgoTfC97-b4S4tigSelChAnilM&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Dickin%2C%20A.%20P.%20(2005).%20Radiogenic%20Isotope%20Geology.%20Cambridge%20University%20Press.&f=false)

[4] Steiger, R. H & Jäger, E. (1977). Subcommittee on Geochronology: Convention on the use of decay constants in Geo- and Cosmochronology . *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*. 36,(3), 359-362

<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2319799>

[5] Ludwig, K. R. (2012). *(Isoplot/Ex: A Geochronological Toolkit for Microsoft Excel* .Berkeley Geochronology Center Special Publication.

<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=509883>

[6] Allegre, C. J., Manhès, G & Göpel, C. (1995). The age of the Earth . *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0016703795000544>

[7] Doe, B. R & Deleveau, M. H. (1995). The evolution of the isotope geology of the Earth: A tribute to George W. Wetherill .*Reviews of Geophysics*

<https://adsabs.harvard.edu/full/1990AREPS..18..205W>

[8] Russell, W. A., Papanastassiou, D. A & Tombrello, T. A. (1978). Ca isotope fractionation on the Earth and other solar system materials .  
*Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* ◊

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0016703778901059>

[9] Gentry, R. V. (1986). Radiohalos: A tale of three failures .*Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism* ◊

<https://thetruthsource.org/instantaneous-creation-part-iv-abstract/>

[10] Woodmorappe, J. (1999) .(*Studies in Flood Geology* .Institute for Creation Research.

[https://books.google.com.eg/books/about/Studies\\_in\\_Flood\\_Geology.html?id=qwa6AAAACAAJ&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.com.eg/books/about/Studies_in_Flood_Geology.html?id=qwa6AAAACAAJ&redir_esc=y)

[11] Vardiman, L., Snelling, A. A & Chaffin, E. F. 2003 .*Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth: Results of the RATE Initiative* .Institute for Creation Research.)

[https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1180&context=icc\\_proceedings](https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1180&context=icc_proceedings)

[12] Wiens, R. C. 2002 .*Radiometric Dating: A Christian Perspective* . American Scientific Affiliation.

<https://www.asa3.org/ASA/resources/Wiens2002.pdf>

[13] Taylor, S. R & McLennan, S. M. 1995. *The Continental Crust: Its Composition and Evolution* .Blackwell Scientific Publications.

<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1763087>

[14] Allègre, C. J. 2005. *Isotope Geology* .Cambridge University Press

[https://scholar.google.com.eg/scholar?q=All%C3%A8gre,+C.+J.+2005.Isotope+Geology.+Cambridge+University+Press&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0&as\\_vis=1&oi=scholar](https://scholar.google.com.eg/scholar?q=All%C3%A8gre,+C.+J.+2005.Isotope+Geology.+Cambridge+University+Press&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholar)

[15, 16] Conventional Equation inventor/origin resource:

Rutherford, E. (1906). *Radioactive Transformations*.  
<https://www.hlevkin.com/hlevkin/90MathPhysBioBooks/Physics/Physics/NuclearPhysics/radioactivetrans00ruth.pdf>

Rutherford, E. (1905). "Present problems in radioactivity." *Popular Science Monthly*, 67, 1-34.  
[https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Popular\\_Science\\_Monthly/Volume\\_67/May\\_1905/Present\\_Problems\\_in\\_Radioactivity](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Popular_Science_Monthly/Volume_67/May_1905/Present_Problems_in_Radioactivity)

[17, 18] U-Pb (Zircon)

Wilde, S.A., Valley, J.W., Peck, W.H., & Graham, C.M. (2001). "Evidence from detrital zircons for the existence of continental crust and oceans on the Earth 4.4 Gyr ago." *Nature*, 409(6817), 175-178.  
<https://www.nature.com/articles/35051550>

Mattinson, J.M. (2005). "Zircon U-Pb chemical abrasion (CA-TIMS) method." *Chemical Geology*, 220(1-2), 47-66.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S000925410501452>

[19, 20] Rb-Sr (Mica)

Allègre, C.J., et al. (1969). "Rubidium-strontium age of the Kola Peninsula." *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 6(1), 24-28.  
[https://scholar.google.com.eg/scholar?start=10&q=All%C3%A8gre,+C.J.,+et+al.+1969.+Rubidium-strontium+age+of+the+Kola+Peninsula&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0,5&as\\_vis=1](https://scholar.google.com.eg/scholar?start=10&q=All%C3%A8gre,+C.J.,+et+al.+1969.+Rubidium-strontium+age+of+the+Kola+Peninsula&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5&as_vis=1)

Faure, G., & Mensing, T.M. (2005). *Isotopes: Principles and Applications* (3rd ed.). Wiley. (Chapter on Rb-Sr dating)  
<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1769865>

[21, 22] Sm-Nd (Basalt)

DePaolo, D.J., & Wasserburg, G.J. (1976). "Nd isotopic variations and petrogenetic models." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 3(5), 249-252.  
<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/GL003i005p00249>

Lugmair, G.W., & Marti, K. (1978). "Lunar initial  $^{143}\text{Nd}/^{144}\text{Nd}$ ." *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 39(3), 349-357.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0012821X78900213>

[23, 24] K-Ar (Feldspar)

McDougall, I., & Harrison, T.M. (1999). *Geochronology and Thermochronology by the  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  Method* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.  
<https://www.scrip.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=223331>

Dalrymple, G.B., & Lanphere, M.A. (1969). *Potassium-Argon Dating: Principles, Techniques and Applications to Geochronology*. W.H. Freeman.  
[https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4757-9694-0\\_4](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4757-9694-0_4)

[25, 26] Re-Os (Shale)

Ravizza, G., & Turekian, K.K. (1989). "Application of the  $^{187}\text{Re}$ - $^{187}\text{Os}$  system to black shale geochronometry." *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 53(12), 3257-3262.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0016703789901051>

Selby, D., & Creaser, R.A. (2003). "Re-Os geochronology of organic rich sediments"  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0009254103001992?via%3Dihub>

[27, 28] Lu-Hf (Garnet)

Scherer, E., Münker, C., & Mezger, K. (2001). "Calibration of the lutetium-hafnium clock." *Science*, 293(5530), 683-687.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11474108/>

Anczkiewicz, R., et al. (2004). "Lu-Hf garnet geochronology." *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 225(1-2).  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0012821X04003796?via%3Dihub>

[29, 30] Pb-Pb (Whole Rock)

Patterson, C. (1956). "Age of meteorites and the Earth." *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 10(4), 230-237.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0016703756900369>

Tatsumoto, M., Knight, R.J., & Allègre, C.J. (1973). "Time differences in the formation of meteorites." *Science*, 180(4092), 1279-1283.

<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.180.4092.1279>

[31, 32] Th-Pb (Monazite)

Parrish, R.R. (1990). "U-Pb dating of monazite and its application to geological problems." *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0016703796002141>

Cherniak, D.J., et al. (2004). "Pb diffusion in monazite." *Chemical Geology*.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0016703703005593>

[33,34]  $^{230}\text{Th}/^{238}\text{U}$  (Carbonate) - Th-230

Edwards, R.L., Chen, J.H., & Wasserburg, G.J. (1987). " $^{238}\text{U}$ - $^{234}\text{U}$ - $^{230}\text{Th}$ - $^{232}\text{Th}$  systematics and the precise measurement of time over the past 500,000 years." *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*.

<https://experts.umn.edu/en/publications/sup238supusup234supusup230supthsup232supth-systematics-and-the-pr/>

Cheng, H., et al. (2000). "The half-lives of uranium-234 and thorium-230." *Chemical Geology*, 169(1-2), 17-33.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0009254199001576>

[35, 36] Ar-Ar (Plagioclase)

Renne, P.R., et al. (1998). "Intercalibration of standards, absolute ages and uncertainties in  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  dating." *Chemical Geology*, 145(1-2), 117-152.

<https://www.researchwithrutgers.com/en/publications/intercalibration-of-standards-absolute-ages-and-uncertainties-in/>

McDougall, I., & Harrison, T.M. (1999). *Geochronology and Thermochronology by the  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  Method*. Oxford University Press.

<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=223331>

[37, 38] Sm-Nd (Gabbro)

Jacobsen, S.B., & Wasserburg, G.J. (1980). "Sm-Nd isotopic evolution of chondrites." *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 50(1), 139-155.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0012821X80901259>

DePaolo, D.J. (1981). "Neodymium isotopes in the Colorado Front Range." *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 45(8), 1167-1178.

<https://epdf.pub/the-evolving-continents-understanding-processes-of-continental-growth-special-pu.html>

[39,40] Rb-Sr (Granite)

York, D., & Farquhar, R.M. (1972). *The Earth's Age and Geochronology*. Pergamon Press. (Chapter on Rb-Sr in granites)

<https://www.nature.com/articles/238053a0.pdf>

Moorbath, S., et al. (1972). "Further rubidium-strontium age determinations on the very early Precambrian rocks." *Nature*, 240(5379), 78-82.

<https://www.nature.com/articles/physci240078a0>

[41] Harmon, M. E. (1986). *Ecology of Coarse Woody Debris in Temperate Ecosystems*.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/chapter/bookseries/abs/pii/S006525040860121X>

[42] Harmon, M. E., & Chen, H. (1991). *Dynamics of wood decomposition*.

<https://repository.si.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/9b3f3911-240c-4d98-9772-f3b294c19bf1/content>

[43] Kim G. Mattson, (1987). *Decomposition of woody debris in a regenerating, clear-cut forest in the Southern Appalachians*.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255625766\\_Decomposition\\_of\\_woody\\_debris\\_in\\_a\\_regenerating\\_clear-cut\\_forest\\_in\\_the\\_Southern\\_Appalachians](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255625766_Decomposition_of_woody_debris_in_a_regenerating_clear-cut_forest_in_the_Southern_Appalachians)

[44] Mark E Harmon , (1982). *Decomposition of standing dead trees in the southern Appalachian-Mountains*

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28310510/>

- [45] Turner, G. (2013). "Time scales of critical events around the Cretaceous–Paleogene boundary." *Science*, 339(6120), 684–687

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cretaceous%E2%80%93Paleogene\\_extinction\\_event](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cretaceous%E2%80%93Paleogene_extinction_event)

- [46] Jaffey, A. H., Flynn, K. F., Glendenin, L. E., Bentley, W. C., & Essling, A. M. (1971) Precision measurement of the half-lives and specific activities of  $U^{235}$  &  $U^{238}$  *Physical Review C*, 4(5), 1889–1906

<https://journals.aps.org/prc/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevC.4.1889>

- [47] UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL , (Feb 2025) Paleontology Shaken: Organic Molecules Found in 66-Million-Year-Old Dinosaur Bones. <https://scitechdaily.com/paleontology-shaken-organic-molecules-found-in-66-million-year-old-dinosaur-bones/>

“Evidence for Endogenous Collagen in Edmontosaurus Fossil Bone” by Lucien Tuinstra, Brian Thomas, Steven Robinson, Krzysztof Pawlak, Gazmend Elezi, Kym Francis Faull and Stephen Taylor, 17 January 2025, *Analytical Chemistry*.

[DOI: 10.1021/acs.analchem.4c03115](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.4c03115)

- [48] IUPAC/Steiger, R. H., & Jäger, E. (1977). Subcommission on Geochronology. (The ref. value is calculated using the standard {U} - {Pb} exponential decay equation to yield the specific age of {66 million years})

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0012821X77900607?via%3Dihub>

- [49] Bada, J. L., & Schimmelmann, A. (2018). Survival of Biomolecules in Geological Environments. (The ref. rate is derived from established maximum half-lives for proteins {such as 4.4 million years}, representing the absolute theoretical maximum persistence under ideal conditions).

[https://scholar.google.com.eg/scholar?q=Bada,+J.+L.,+%26+Schimmelmann,+A.+\(2018\).+Survival+of+Biomolecules+in+Geological+Environments.&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0&as\\_vis=1&oi=scholart](https://scholar.google.com.eg/scholar?q=Bada,+J.+L.,+%26+Schimmelmann,+A.+(2018).+Survival+of+Biomolecules+in+Geological+Environments.&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholart)

[50] Steiger R.H. and Jager E, (1977). Subcommission on Geochronology

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(77\)90060-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(77)90060-7)

[51] Snelling A.A., (2001). Excess Argon : The Achilles' Heel of potassium- Argon dating.

<https://www.icr.org/content/excess-argon-archilles-heel-potassium-argon-and-argon-argon-dating-volcanic-rocks>

[52] Ian C. Lyon, Monika A. Kusiak , et al , *Pb nanospheres in ancient zircon yield model ages for zircon formation and Pb mobilization*, volume 9 , Article number: 13702 (2019)

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-019-49882-8>