

18 *Miscellaneous Claims*

Other Miscellaneous Young Earth Claims

There are claims asserted by young earth that are meant to be minor yet still make the picture appear overwhelming. These miscellaneous claims of Ackerman's *It's A Young World After All* (1993) and Slusher's *The Age of the Cosmos* (1980), however, are some of the most popular. They are simplistic, and thus easy to present even though they are all false. You will find these arguments are still circulating as of 2007 among young earth journals, blogs and websites. Thus, they be continually rebuffed until abandoned. Here are some brief discussions on the most important and enduring miscellaneous points of young earthers.

Sirius B.

This star is said by Ackerman to be a white dwarf. (This is technically false.)¹ In Cicero's time, and mentioned in other ancient writings, Sirius was seen as "red." (Ackerman ignores that the Chinese said it was white.)² Because it takes at least 100,000 years for a red giant to become a white dwarf, the universe is allegedly young. (Ackerman, *id.* at 67.)³ What Ackerman really means is that the Roman-era observations, if true, prove this transition took place in 1,000-

1. As a Christian astronomer, Christopher Sharp, pointed out in a 2005 letter to Dr. James Kennedy: "You also said that it is a white dwarf, that is technically not correct. Sirius is a binary star consisting of a bright white star known since antiquity, and a very faint white dwarf, which was only found in the 1800s." <http://www.csharp.com/kennedy.html> (accessed 12/14/07).

2,000 years.⁴ Hence, if science says it requires 100,000 years, but we ‘know’ it took place in 2,000 years or less, then we must not understand stellar evolution very well. Thus, all our time calculations are supposedly faulty.

Clearly, science does say a red giant could not change into a white dwarf in merely 2,000 years. Also large nebula would be left behind if this happened recently, but there are none. While it is always possible we do not understand stellar evolution, there are more likely explanations. The Egyptians and Romans could have made observations at angles that would make Sirius B appear to be red when indeed it was white.⁵ This explains why simultaneously the Chinese saw it as white.

Certainly, there is a mystery here. It does not prove much. It raises questions about the meaningfulness of conflicting observations by ancient astronomers. It does not prove a young earth.

Spiral Galaxies.

Kevin Pendegast years ago demonstrated that spiral galaxies should normally collapse in two to three rotations. Slusher who is labeled as the “creation science” astronomer (but who only holds degrees in geophysics) in 1980 pointed out that each rotation should take a few hundred million years which means, unless something else is preventing collapse,

-
2. Christian Sharp, a Christian astronomer, wrote in 2005: “Why the Egyptians, Romans and Greeks claimed Sirius was red is a bit of a mystery that may never be fully resolved...*The ancient Chinese recorded Sirius to be white*, and they are considered to have made reliable records that can be backed up in the case of planets, comets and supernova explosions, which can be checked independently.” <http://www.csharp.com/kennedy.html> (accessed 12/14/07).

that the universe cannot be older than 2 billion years. If this is so, Slusher argued that none of astronomers figures about a 15 by old universe can be trusted.⁶

This argument ignores the later research results of Pendergrast in 1971 demonstrated that as long as new stars continue to form at a significant rate within the galaxy, the spiral structure will be maintained. This is exactly what is going on at the center of these galaxies. This evidence led to the discovery of new and old galaxies. It also confirmed the big bang scenario once more by comparing the ratio of young

-
3. You can find this chapter from Ackerman's book online still in 2007 at <http://www.creationism.org/ackerman/AckermanYoungWorldChap07.htm> (accessed 12/10/07). Ackerman gives one the misleading impression that an objective symposium came up with this conclusion. However, it was a symposium orchestrated by Kazmann to give attention to young earth claims of Gentry — whose halo claims are totally bogus. See Footnote 3, page 186. On Gentry, see "Halo Dating" on page 149."

The pertinent text from Ackerman is: "In 1978 at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, a symposium of *top scientists* was held to discuss the issue of time and the age of the earth and cosmos. [Footnote's cite to Kazmann here]. Certain problems and paradoxes in the current conception of cosmic antiquity were explored by the scientists at this gathering. Among the fascinating topics discussed was a puzzle known as the Sirius mystery. This mystery centers on a star named Sirius B, which is a type of star referred to as a "white dwarf." The problem stems from the fact that although ancient astronomers were also well acquainted with this star, unlike our present-day astronomers they described Sirius as red rather than white! Modern astronomers are forced to accept the idea that within historical times Sirius B has transformed from a red giant to a white dwarf star. What is the problem with that? The mystery of Sirius B is that according to present conceptions of thermonuclear star radiation (see chapter 6), it should take at least 100,000 years for a red giant star to collapse into a white dwarf star. Something is obviously wrong with our present conception of how stars work."

Ackerman cites the symposium's work as Raphael G. Kazmann, "It's About Time: 4.5 Billion Years," *Geotimes* (September 1978) at 18-20.

and old galaxies. Also, the very existence of spiral galaxies proves the universe cannot be less than 12 billion years nor exceed 26 billion years in age.⁷

The Field-Galaxy Mystery

Clusters of galaxies should break up in a couple of million years if you assume you are seeing all the star mass. (Ackerman, at 68-69.) It turns out we know that not all matter is luminous, *i.e.*, there is also cold dark matter (CDM). We have learned how to determine how much cold dark matter there is. This has been confirmed observationally by gravitational lensing where the light from the furthest blue galaxies is bent by intervening cold dark matter. It turns out that it is exactly equal to the missing CDM needed to explain why galaxies do not break up.

-
4. Young earther Donald De Young who uses the Sirius change to say “there is evidence that the dwarf companion of Sirius formed from a red giant in just 1,000 years.” See De Young at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/399.asp> (accessed 12/10/2007).
 5. Christopher Sharp, from the astronomy department of the University of Arizona, explains: “Exactly why the Egyptians, Romans and Greeks claimed it was red is not very clear, the most plausible theory is related to its helical rising at the time the Nile flooded, and when low down in the sky will appear red, as do the sun and moon. Being so bright the effect of atmospheric absorption will be more noticeable than any other star.” <http://www.csharp.com/kennedy.html> (accessed 12/14/07).
 6. Harold S. Slusher, *The Age of the Cosmos* (San Diego: Institute for Creation Research, 1980) at 15-16.
 7. Kevin H. Pendergrast, *The Evolution of Galaxy Structures, June Institute Lectures* (Dept of Astronomy, University of Toronto) (1971); Ron Cowen, “Were Spatial Galaxies Once More Common,” *Science News* Vol. 142 (1992) at 390; Ron Cowen, “Tracking the Evolution of Galaxies,” *Science News* Vol. 143 (1993) at 15.

Diatoms.

This microscopic sea creature has a shell that does not decompose when it dies. The minute shells settle down to the ocean bottom and form under the right conditions diatomaceous earth. Such “deposits can run hundreds of feet in thickness.” Ackerman acknowledges that this is “a considerable problem for the idea of a young earth.”⁸ This is because it would take millions of years to lay down the 1,500 in depth of such earth that we sometimes see.

However, Ackerman finds a rebuttal in the fact that in one quarry of diatomaceous-earth, a baleen whale’s skeleton was uncovered. The whale was “standing on end in the quarry and is being exposed gradually as the diatomite is mined.” The whale was 80 feet long. (Ackerman, at 81-83.) Other similar finds have been made in Peru.

However, scientists, including Christian ones, say this is explained as due to a rapid burial event. One such Christian, Wonderly, wrote: “We now know of large sediment flows in various parts of the world which apparently had all of the characteristics necessary for overwhelming and burying both swift and large marine animals.”⁹

Yet, young earthers ask us to think the whale proves we can never trust that indeed sedimentary layers were laid down over long periods of time. If this were true, then why are there supposedly millions of generations of diatoms existing alongside a buried whale? Hence, young earthers say the whale proves these sedimentary layers of diatoms must always be laid down in a few generations, and thus such diatomaceous-earth is laid down quickly, not in millions of

8. <http://www.creationism.org/ackerman/AckermanYoungWorldChap09.htm> (accessed 12/14/07).

9. Daniel L. Wonderly, *Neglect of Geologic Data: Sedimentary Strata Compared with Young Earth Creationist Writings* (2006) at 76, available online at www.asa3.org/ASA/resources/Wonderly2006.pdf (accessed 12/07).

years. For with the whale, a large layer of diatoms must have died all together to surround this single whale fossil.¹⁰ These young earth deductions are wrong.

Clearly, all we are seeing is a reworking of diatomaceous earth to bury the whale. Old-earth Creationists offer the latter as the better explanation.¹¹

What seems more reasonable? Diatomaceous earth is a form of soil. Thus, it seems sloughing in certain locations is a reasonable explanation.

Regardless, since God set the length of generations for diatoms, so we could infer the time to lay down layers of earth, the only way the young earth argument works is if God is a deceiver. For He would have to deceptively have placed millions of generations alongside a whale that died. Why would God set the timing-pattern of generations of diatoms, leading us to infer an old earth? So we would see the anomaly the whale presents, and we would confess a young earth is the best explanation? Well, we might find there is a young earth, but we lose respect for the One who created it. For He is now a deceiver by the very proof and argument put forth by the young earther. The young earth explanation is not a worthwhile explanation. It is even anti-spiritual.

10. One young earther argued: “How do you suppose that whale managed to stand on its tail for thousands of years without decaying or being eaten by scavengers while all those layers of diatomaceous earth formed years apart?” See <http://www.mashiyach.com/evolution.htm> (accessed 12/14/07). This argument first appears in Morris, *Scientific Creationism* (1974) at 97-98.

11. See Greg Neyman, “Creation Science Rebuttals — Dead Whales, Telling Tale, *Creation Magazine* Volume 26, Issue 4, September 2004,” in *Answers In Creation* (March 23, 2006), reprinted at http://www.answersincreation.org/rebuttal/magazines/Creation/2004/article_v26_4_whales.htm (accessed 11-24-07).

Polystrate Fossils.

Ackerman says trees sometimes grow through multiple layers of sediment. (Ackerman, *id.* at 84.)¹² This is *untrue*. Rather, sometimes trees are found encased in limestone rock. (John Morris, *The Young Earth* (2005) at 101.)

Regardless, both Ackerman and Morris deduce from fossil trees a young earth. What they mean is, if it takes millions of years to deposit layers of sediment, then how can the tree be found encased in rock? Easy: the deposits around the tree were made in a sudden flood. This proves a local catastrophe. It does not prove a young earth.

The young earth interpretation depends upon a fallacious assumption of slow deposition as the only possible explanaton. Young earthers deny that science is permitted to explain *any* geoglical formation by a local flood. The young earthers insist science is in a box and can *never ever* rely upon *any* flood event from the past as an explanaton of a geological event due to science's supposed rejection of an universal flood in Noah's day.¹³

However, there is never any logical proof for this core assumption to the polystrate fossil argument. The truth is simple: the trees grow in one layer and then due to floods other sediment forms to surround their trunks. It hardens like cement into rock. Science is not precluded from relying upon ancient floods to explain a geological formation. That local

12. Another presentation of this young earth argument can be found at <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/1991> (accessed 12/14/07) entitled "The Young Earth," by Bert Thompson, Ph.D.

13. "I believe that during the flood, as described in the Bible, several layers of soft sediments were washed in place around the tree. A short time later, as the flood waters receded, the sediments would turn to stone similar to the way cement hardens when it dries. The Evolutionist who doesn't believe the Bible, and does not believe there ever was a flood cannot allow himself to accept this interpretation. Because if there was a flood, then the Bible was right. And if the Bible was right, then there is a God." *The Bible and the Young Age of the Earth* at <http://www.angelfire.com/mi/dinosaurs/earthage.html> (accessed 12/07).

floods sometimes occur has never been denied by science. It is utter nonsense to even suggest that science is not permitted *ever* to explain a geological formation by a flood event.¹⁴

So what do fossil trees in multiple strata prove? It proves only one thing: the utter desperation of young earthers. They cite irrelevant material to reach an irrational interpretation of polystrate fossils. These fossils simply prove there are sometimes floods. Trees do not grow through multiple layers of limestone as Ackerman claims. Such ridiculous inference is frustrating to even have to address. It does not even belong in the debate. Yet, this polystrate fossil claim persists in 2007.

Re-alignment of Earth by Asteroid Impact.

Ackerman argues evidence of an asteroid impact near Noah's time helps prove the flood and that our time scales are wrong. (*Id.* at 88.)¹⁵ The evidence offered about this impact¹⁶ was based upon an unpublished manuscript from 1936 written by an Australian astronomer. The draft was resurrected decades after this astronomer died by a fellow Australian — Barry Setterfeld.

When the astronomer's draft paper was presented by a non-scientist (Setterfeld) at a young earth seminar over a decade ago, *real* scientists spoke up at the conference. They

14. For a more extensive rebuttal to the polystrate fossil argument, see Andrew MacRae "Polystrate Tree Fossils" (1997) reprinted at <http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/polystrate/trees.html> (accessed 12/07).

15. This chapter is available online at <http://www.creationism.org/ackerman/AckermanYoungWorldChap11.htm> (accessed 12/14/07).

16. Carl Wieland, "An Asteroid Tilts the Earth," *Ex Nihilo*. January 1983, at 12-14; and Barry Setterfield, "An Asteroid Tilts the Earth?" *Ex Nihilo*, April 1983, at 6-8. This is a young earth journal.

demonstrated the paper's improper calculations, and that it was fatally flawed. The presenter (Setterfeld) confessed the draft paper was never finalized by the now dead scientist.¹⁷

Yet, even if it what the draft hoped could be proven were indeed true, it never proves the flood .(I believe in the flood incidentally.) It may suggest in Noah's generation that an asteroid hit earth that re-aligned the axis (Ackerman, at 94-96), but that's not evidence of the flood.

Ackerman goes onto to make improper conjecture. Even if we assume a change in tilt of the earth's axis due to an imaginary asteriod impact, how this impacts the age of the

17. The proof offered in "An Asteroid Tilts the Earth," by Dr. Carl Wieland in *Ex Nihilo*, Vol.5 No.3 (January 1983) at 12 was from an astronomer named George Dodwell who in 1936 wrote an "unpublished manuscript" which contained notes which Barry Setterfeld of Australia relayed to Wieland who then presented them as fact: "When Dodwell graphed the results of how the axis was tilted, based on shadow lengths, they formed a regular curve, known technically as a log sine curve. The results surprised him, but compelled him to conclude that the earth's axis had been behaving as if it was a centre of a spinning top which had been pushed over....A wobbling top will slowly right itself, but never moves all the way back to its former more upright position. If you plotted its behaviour on a graph it would show as a log sine curve. Dodwell's graphs indicated that the earth had been pushed over 27 degrees and from that time until 1850 had been slowly moving back to 23 1/2 degrees which it is today...But when was it pushed over, and how? The graph indicated 2345 B.C. plus or minus a few years. It was at this point that the significance of the results came obvious to Dodwell and his friends."

It should be noted that Ian Bryce (a credentialled scientist) of Australia attended Setterfeld's conference in 1985 when he first resurrected Dodwell's notes and presented them at a scientific conference. Bryce recounts the asteroid lecture. Dr. Joseph Monaghan of Monash University "revealed that Setterfeld had not carried out the basic calculations — the scientists present felt that to carry sufficient momentum, the asteroid travelling a typical 30km per sec would dissipate too much energy. Setterfeld admitted his model was only preliminary, but Joe said it was fatally flawed." *In the Beginning* (ed. Barry Williams) Vol. 5, No. 1 at 16 (available www.skeptics.com.au/journal/beginning/creationism.pdf, accessed 12/14/07). Bryce noted that in US literature, Setterfeld "calls himself a scientist, but out inquiries reveal he has no professional qualifications or experience whatsoever." *Id.*

earth is never adequately explained by Ackerman.¹⁸ It would be preposterous to say the tilt of the earth's axis could ever impact the age-of-the earth analysis. Radiometric dating is not impacted by a planetary tilt. Regardless, the truth remains there is no evidence for such an impact. It lacks any credible empirical proof.

Light Shortcut Through Space.

Slusher in *The Age of the Cosmos* (1980) at 33-37 argued that we should reject Einstein's version of the universe in favor of that proposed by Parry Moon and Domina Spencer in 1953.¹⁹

Moon and Spencer suggested that while the planets existed in Euclidean space (flat), we should recognize that light travels in another geometric dimension known as highly curved Riemannian space.²⁰ If this were true, then star light from the most distant galaxies would arrive in 16 years for indeed they are right around the corner!

18. Ackerman writes: "The realization of these factors stunned Dodwell, for they indicated that something had happened to the earth in 2345 B.C. to cause it to tilt from its axis. Following that sudden and dramatic tilt, the earth began to wobble like a spinning top and gradually recovered to a new axial tilt. Our modern reverse projections *give inaccurate historical dates* because they fail to take this fact into account." (<http://www.creationism.org/ackerman/AckermanYoungWorldChap11.htm> accessed 12/14/07).

19. See Parry Moon & Domina Spencer, "Binary Stars and the Velocity of Light," *Journal of the Optical Society of America* 43 (1953) at 639-645.

20. For a more detailed background, see By Peter Graneau & Neal Graneau, *In the Grip of the Distant Universe: The Science of Inertia* (World Scientific: 2006) at 204. For the original article, downloadable through JSTOR, look for Parry Moon, Domina Eberle Spencer, "Theorems on Separability in Riemannian Space," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (Aug., 1952), at 635-642.

Conclusion

Moon & Spencer in 1953 were trying to disprove Einstein's theory of relativity apparently because it pointed to the fateful "beginning" of the universe. Slusher endorses Moon & Spencer. Slusher, however, fails to note that Moon and Spencer never produced the mathematics to support their assumptions.²¹ Nor did they address difficulties that undercut their hypothesis. For example, their theory implies that light comes at us from two different directions. If so, then you would find duplicate images of all the stars and galaxies.²² This is not true. Hence, the reason their mathematics could never be produced is that their conclusions are contradicted by direct observations. Their theory is patently false.

Conclusion

We have exhausted every significant argument offered in Ackerman's book *It's A Young World After All*, many from Morris and Slusher and other young earth sources. Ackerman does not prove his case. He cites faulty data. He makes faulty assumptions. Finally, he suffers from lack of consistency and logic. His conclusions were all completely bogus. Instead of each argument causing you to grow in a greater and greater appreciation for the conclusion, each chapter and verse causes one greater and greater concern about Ackerman's gullibility, groundless conclusions, and specious analysis, and even the reliability of his ability to find 'facts' upon which a discussion can proceed.

21. Fackerell, "The Age of the Astronomical Universe," *Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* Vol. 1 (1984) at 88.

22. H. Ross, *Time and Creation* (1994) at 99.

Miscellaneous Claims
