

Questions from the Audience: The Sun, the Moon, and Moon Dust

By Dr. John Ankerberg, Dr. Hugh Ross, Dr. Kent Hovind

Ankerberg: I've got a question going back to this deal on entropy and that is, if entropy did not happen until Adam sinned on the sixth day, was there no burning down of the sun on the fourth day, third day, etc.?

Hovind: If the sun is burning—there's two theories about how the sun burns, you know, by gravitational collapse, therefore it's burning up its fuel; or the other one, just nuclear fusion. A very little energy would go a long time. I don't know how God would have done that forever.

Ross: They both involve entropy.

Hovind: Yeah. The sun is burning, there's no question. How God would have done that forever...the fact that we see so many things in entropy like the moon leaving us a couple of inches a year or the human population getting more genetic load, all of the things from entropy indicate the universe is not billions of years old, maybe, you know....

Ankerberg: Let's talk about that one, too, in the fact of the moon pulling away, you've got the moon and a couple of examples. Number one, of the moon pulling away a couple of inches every year, therefore if you take it all the way back to the beginning, the earth ought to be young. All right? Is there something wrong with that idea?

Ross: Definitely. He is assuming that the spiraling away of the moon from the earth is linear. No astronomer believes it's linear. Newton's laws of motion prove that it can't possibly be linear. If you use those laws you discover that it's consistent with the moon separating close to the earth about 4-1/4 billion years ago. And so the spiraling away of the moon is consistent with an old earth interpretation, not a young earth interpretation. I think it's good to point out, too, if you're saying no entropy until the Fall of man, that also means no gravity, no electro magneticism, no nuclear physics would be taking place. Those are all intertwined with entropy. So you get a complete breakdown of the laws of physics in the young earth view at the Fall of Adam, which I have argued contradicts what the Scripture clearly teaches. It's also something that can't possibly be hidden from the astronomer's view through the telescope.

Ankerberg: Kent?

Hovind: As far as when entropy came into the world, I don't know. I suspect it was at the Fall of Adam. The Bible says God looked at everything at the end of chapter 1 and said it was very good. The Bible tells us very clearly in Exodus 20:11 God said, I want you to rest on the seventh because I made everything in six days—everything in heaven, the earth, the sea, and all that in them is. And if the average layman cannot understand that verse, then the Bible is incapable of being understood.

Ross: Well, I agree with that—it was done in six days. You see in the Westminster Confession that God created the universe in six days. Notice the Westminster Confession doesn't say six 24-hour days. It just says six days.

Hovind: I could add that for them, if you'd like.

Ross: I would prefer you don't, because I don't think they would have. I mean, there's a reason why they didn't stick that in.

Hovind: Because they'd never been to my seminar.

Ankerberg: All right, let's go to another question here and that is, let's pick up this thing of moon dust because it has come up in quite a few conversations we've had in the past. And that is that at one time folks, there were scientists who thought that the amount of moon dust that was being collected on the moon would be over 146 feet. In fact, the space pod was getting ready for that and that was calculated by the number of years that it was supposed to be up there in terms of being very, very old. When they got there it was what? two inches or something? All right, so what has taken place? What does the lack of moon dust, one way or the other, prove?

Ross: Well, the moon dust experiment was first attempted in 1960. Hans Pettersson. I've got the paper. You can check it out. He took a filter four feet off the ground on Molokai, assumed all the dust coming through the filter was cosmic dust. But he states in his paper quite obviously that's not true. There was going to be a lot of earth dust circulating through this. So this is simply a limit. He encouraged in his paper the experiment be done with balloon experiments; better yet, satellite experiments. Those were done a few years later when he discovered he was off by at least a factor of eleven hundred times. The measurements they got from the satellites predicted that four and a quarter billion years of accumulation of dust on the moon should give you about 60 millimeters. When they went to the moon, that's what they found. So it's consistent with an old earth interpretation, not a young earth interpretation.

Hovind: I think you get an example where your prejudice, your preconceived idea determines your observations. The dust from the moon is only one part out of 67, is really from outer space. Most of it is regurgitated lunar soil. When an object hits the moon at high speed, it blows up a bunch of other dust. So I think if you figure in the one to 67 factor, there's a whole lot of these equations on Walt Brown's web site creationscience.com and he says there should be about a thousand feet of dust on the moon in 4.6 billion years, figuring in the one to 67 factor. I don't know how much dust should be on the moon. I know there wasn't much and I think that's consistent with a young earth model, that the whole universe was created in six days just like God said. I have no problem with that.

Ross: You can't get 60 millimeters of moon dust in such a brief period of time.

Hovind: See, the problem you have, Hugh, is you're stuck with this uniformitarian assumption. The Bible predicted people in the latter days would come that would teach the way things are happening now is the way they've always been happening—2 Peter 3. And

you're an example of this. We see the moon dust in 1960 and 1970 and 1980. We've checked the dust today and assume, well, that's the way it has always been. This is uniformitarianism. This was Charles Lyell's problem and several times in the last previous debates Hugh has referred to, you know, the fossil record or the geologic column. Well, I taught earth science for years. You can only find that dumb geologic column one place in the world. That's in the textbooks. It doesn't exist. Charles Lyell made up the whole thing. All those layers of rock that we see were formed during the Flood in the days of Noah. I've got pictures on my web site of petrified trees standing up running through a whole different bunch of layers.

Ross: You're misrepresenting the field. What geophysicists and geologists believe is that it's a combination of catastrophism and uniformitarianism. It's not either/or.

Hovind: Here you are speaking for all geologists again. You do this consistently and I wish you'd stop and think about what you're doing.

Ross: Well, find a secular geologist that doesn't endorse catastrophism. They all endorse it.

Hovind: I can find lots of geologists that don't endorse the idea...that do believe all those layers were deposited in a flood.

Ross: I would agree but many floods, not just one.

Hovind: No. Just one big flood formed nearly all the layers. And so in one sense, it doesn't matter what any geologist says. What does God's Word say? It's real clear. Your idea of a local flood in the days of Noah, then you're assuming that all of these layers of rock that we see all over the world were formed slowly over billions of years.

Ross: Some. Not all.

Hovind: Okay. Nearly all. There's just no difference in what you teach and what the evolutionists teach. And your teaching is going to destroy people's faith in God's Word and it's not going to lead people to the Lord. Young Earth Creationism is the plain obvious interpretation.