



PRESENTS

# REASON & REVELATION

A MONTHLY JOURNAL of CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES

## THE YOUNG EARTH

"It is not easy to overthrow a belief, however absurd and harmful it may be, which your civilization has promulgated as the scientific truth for the better part of a century." With these words, Marshall & Sandra Hall, in their book, *The Truth: God or Evolution?*, (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1974. p 74) launch a full-scale investigation into the evolutionists' claims that the universe is not, as the Bible claims, very young, but instead very, very old. The Halls continue by saying: "Time, as poets and insurance salesmen remind us, is the enemy of life. But time has its friends, too. Without great, incomprehensible, immeasurable stretches of time to fall back on, the evolutionists would be sitting ducks for the barbed queries of even high school students. Time is the evolutionists' refuge from the slings and arrows of logic, scientific evidence, common sense, and the multiplication table....The proven uncertainties about scientific dating are a well-kept secret. The average person reading his newspaper or magazine gets the clear impression that dating is a science as exact as the addition of fractions....Since no one can envision ten thousand years—much less a half-million or a million years—'scientists' can hide behind the two thousand millions of years that they say evolution took, and they can hide there in relative safety. They think" (*Ibid.* pp 69,71,75. Emphasis in original.) Or, as Richard M. Pearl so well put it: "To the geologists, time is what space is to the astronomer—vastness beyond the thoughts of people...enough to make 'all things possible'" (*1001 Questions About Earth Sciences.* Dodd & Mead, New York, 1962. p 1).

The point is well made. It *is* difficult to overthrow a false belief when that belief has been taught as "scientific truth" for so long. [The false "Biogenetic Law" of Dr. Ernst Haeckel (1866) which resulted in the totally erroneous idea of embryos proving evolutionary descent is a good case in point.] But it is *especially* difficult to overthrow a false concept when a *whole world view* is based upon such a concept! Such is the relationship between evolution and the long, long spans of time required for it to occur. Evolution without time is not (cannot be!) evolution. Therefore, evolutionists set to the task of "finding" ways to "prove" that the universe is old so

evolution *can* take place. And suddenly—Abracadabra! and the universe is "old"—in spite of the mountains of reliable evidence to the contrary!! It reminds one of the addage, "Don't bother me with the facts: my mind's made up." Yet the evidence is *still* there which does not set well with the claims of an "old earth" (or universe) so often made by evolutionists. Consider the following:

1. **Population Statistics.** One of the strongest arguments for a young earth comes from the field of population kinetics. Without going into full detail here in the short space available, the argument from population statistics states this: Using the formula →

$$P_n = \frac{2}{C-1} (C^{n-x+1}) (C^x-1)$$

it is possible to compute the world population ( $P_n$  = world population after  $n$  generations,  $n$  = number of generations,  $x$  = life span in terms of generations;  $2C$  = number of children per family). If evolutionary figures were to be entered into this formula, with man only having lived on the earth 1,000,000 years (remember: some current evolutionists state that man has been on the earth in excess of 2-3 million years!), there would be an earth population of  $1 \times 10^{5000}$ ! That number is a 1 followed by 5,000 zeroes. But the known universe (at an estimated size of 20 billion light years in diameter) would only hold  $1 \times 10^{100}$  people! There would be  $1 \times 10^{4900}$  people left over! Using creationist figures, however, the current world population would figure out to be approximately 4.34 billion people. The question is, which of the two figures *could possibly be correct*, and which *could not possibly be correct*? The argument from population statistics is extremely powerful in showing that the earth simply cannot be *very* old. [NOTE: This discussion is *highly abbreviated*. For documentation of data shown here, see: *Scientific Studies in Special Creation.* W. Lammerts, Editor, Presbyterian & Reformed, Philadelphia, 1971. pp 198-205. Also see: *The Creation-Evolution Controversy.* R. Wysong, Inquiry Press, East Lansing, Michigan, 1976. pp 168-169.]

2. **Breakdown (Depletion) of the Earth's Magnetic Field.** There are 3 important force fields associated with planet earth: a *gravitational* field, an

*electric* field, and a *magnetic* field. The magnetic field is due to the huge electric current, billions of amperes worth, circulating in the core of the earth. It is now known that the earth's magnetic field is decaying faster than any other worldwide geophysical phenomenon. Knowledgeable scientists do not debate the fact of the rapid decrease in the earth's magnetic field. A comprehensive government report fairly recently estimated, in fact, that the magnetic field would be gone by the year 3991 A.D. Using complex mathematical equations to try to calculate *backwards* (using a known value for the half-life decay rate of the field) presents a *very* serious problem in relation to the values of time needed by evolutionists. The problem is this: going backward for more than just a few thousand years produces an impossibly large value of the magnetic field and of the electrically-generated heat stored in the earth's core. In fact, Dr. Thomas G. Barnes, Professor-Emeritus of Physics at the University of Texas at El Paso, has calculated the upper limit of this time span to be *at most* 10,000 years. Going back any further than this, says Dr. Barnes, would cause the fields to be at such huge values that the earth could not sustain itself, and would rupture and crack open. According to the facts associated with the magnetic field, the upper limit for the age of the earth is 10,000 years! [Cf: (1) Wysong, R., *op. cit.*, p 161; (2) Barnes, T.G. *Origin & Destiny of Earth's Magnetic Field*. Institute for Creation Research. San Diego, CA. 1973; (3) ICR Impact Articles 16,27,100. Institute for Creation Research. 2716 Madison Ave. San Diego, CA. 92116.]

3. **Shrinkage of the Sun.** As late as 1979 researchers from the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and High Altitude Observatory discovered something not only *very unusual*, but *extremely important*. The sun is actually shrinking—at a rate of 0.1% per century, corresponding to a rate of 5 feet per hour (Cf: Lubkin, G.B. *Physics Today*. Vol. 32. No. 17. 1979.). What does this shrinkage have to do with creation/evolution or the age of the universe? Put simply, a creationist, who accepts that the world was created 6,000-8,000 years ago, has very little to be concerned about. An evolutionist, however, has a *severe* problem. If the rate of shrinkage has remained constant, as uniformitarianism would predict (demand!), 100,000 years ago the sun would be twice the size it is now. In fact, one could only go back to a maximum of *20 million B.C. before the surface of the earth would actually touch* the sun! Supposedly, by 20 million B.C. all of evolution had already occurred, except the final stage of the primate turning into man. Amazing, then, is it not, that since evolution

to the final stage took from 500 million to 2,000 million years to occur (as we are always told), it would have taken place *inside the sun* because any time span beyond 20 million B.C. places the earth inside the sun's huge size!! Stop to consider what would happen at just 100,000 years ago, when the sun was just twice its current size?! Any kind of life on earth, with a sun *that* size putting out *that* amount of heat, would have been impossible. Thus, all life on earth would have to be less than 100,000 years old! Evolution occurring in less than 100,000 years??? Absurd!! And that is exactly the point!! (Cf: ICR Impact Article 82.).

4. **Hydrogen In The Universe.** Hydrogen is constantly being converted into helium throughout the universe. Significantly, however, hydrogen cannot be produced in any significant quantity through the conversion of other elements. If the universe were vastly old, there should now be little hydrogen left in it—since hydrogen is constantly being converted into helium and since this conversion is a one-way process. Sir Fred Hoyle, the eminent British astronomer/cosmologist, reminds us however that "the universe consists almost entirely of hydrogen." Dr. Hoyle was therefore driven to conclude. "How comes it then that the universe consists almost entirely of hydrogen? If matter was infinitely old, this would be quite impossible. So we can see that the universe being what it is, *the creation issue simply cannot be dodged*" (*The Nature Of The Universe*. Harper. New York. 1960. p 125.). [Emphasis added]

Dr. Hoyle was driven to invent, because of the evidence from the hydrogen in the universe, his "continuous-creation" (steady-state) hypothesis. Even Bertrand Russell, recognizing this evidence along with that of a contingent universe, admitted that the implication was that matter could not be infinitely old because the cosmos would had to have had a beginning at some definite date (Cf: *The Scientific Outlook*. George Allen & Unwin. London. 1931. p 122.). The conclusion is, since the universe consists chiefly of hydrogen, and since we have no evidence of any kind of current hydrogen genesis, that the concentration of hydrogen speaks eloquently of a *youthful universe!*

5. **Atmospheric Helium.** Another type of geophysical chronometer indicating an anomalously youthful age of the earth is the accumulation of radioactively derived gases in the atmosphere. The most important of these is helium, which is derived from the disintegration of uranium and thorium in the earth's crust. Some of this radiogenic helium escapes and finds its way to the earth's surface where

it is added to the atmosphere. It has been recognized for many years, however, that there is not nearly enough helium in the atmosphere to correspond to the alleged age of the earth and the rate of escape of helium into the atmosphere from rocks forming the crust of the earth. Scientists have stated that the present atmosphere contains  $3.5 \times 10^{15}$  grams of helium, and that the rate of helium formation is  $3 \times 10^{11}$  grams/year. Given these figures, the earth's age turns out to be in the neighborhood of 10,000 years.

In order to "explain" this "difficulty," evolutionary scientists assume that the excess helium generated in the past (which *should* be here but is *not*) has "somehow" attained escape velocity, overcoming gravity and escaping from the atmosphere completely. This requires that temperatures in the exosphere (the outermost portion of the atmosphere) must be *extremely* high—between 1800 and 2300 degrees Celsius (Cf: Bates, D.R. "Composition and Structure of the Atmosphere." IN: *The Earth and Its Atmosphere*. Basic Books. New York. 1957. p 107.). As one author commented in regard to these unbelievably (and totally undocumented) temperatures: "Some theorists find the high temperatures mentioned difficult to accept" (*Ibid.*). This is an understatement, since no independent evidence of such temperatures exists. In other words, instead of accepting the obvious conclusion from the helium content of the earth's atmosphere that the earth's age must be relatively young, evolutionary scientists prefer to believe that the exosphere temperatures *had* to have been large enough to permit helium to escape—*regardless of how extreme this requirement must be!* [For readers desiring additional information, see: (1) Wysong, R. *op. cit.* pp 162-163; (2) Morris, Henry M. *Scientific Creationism*. Creation-Life Publishers. San Diego, CA. 1974. pp 150-151.]

### CONCLUSION

There are many other equally reliable methods which indicate the earth and universe to be quite *young*. The concentrations of certain elements and/or compounds in the oceans (e.g.: uranium, sodium, nickel, cesium, potassium, copper, gold, tin, aluminum, etc.) should be *much* larger than they currently are *if* the earth were very old. As they stand now, these concentrations indicate a *very* young earth. The existence of natural gas, under high pressure, in oil fields covered by very porous rocks, gives a good indication of a young earth. Dr. Melvin Cook, an eminent award-winning geologist, reported in his classic work, *Prehistory and Earth Models*, (Max

Parish. London. 1960.), that the upper limit of the age of the earth would be approximately 10,000 years based on the quantities of natural gas at such pressures. The influx of cosmic dust to either the earth or moon also does not fit with an "old earth" hypothesis. Cosmic dust is currently filtering down to earth, for example, at a rate of some 14 million tons per year. Based on its high nickel content, it is possible to detect this cosmic dust, which should be at levels of 50 or more feet on the earth (or accounted for on the basis of nickel content in the oceans). Yet there is only enough cosmic dust on the earth (or moon for that matter) to yield an estimated age of a few thousand years.

These kinds of examples are far too numerous to give here. There is good scientific evidence that the earth, rather than being billions of years old, has an age measured in only a few thousand years, just as the Bible plainly indicates. "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth" (Genesis 1:1). According to both biblical and scientific evidence available, that "beginning" wasn't too very long ago. And as a reminder, let us state again that there is no need to be intimidated by the claims of evolutionists that they have a multi-billion year old earth. The over 75 scientific methods showing the earth to be young indicate otherwise, as does Bible teaching. **BT**

### A SPECIAL NOTE TO OUR READERS

Those of you who have been subscribing to *Reason & Revelation* during 1981 will no doubt have noticed that with this issue the journal takes on a "new appearance" with improved typestyles, bolder headings, justified margins, etc. An explanation is in order.

Several months ago a medical doctor in Texas, who has often assisted us financially in this work, called to ask about our immediate needs. Subsequently, he donated a new I.B.M. typesetter/composer to Apologetics Press, Inc.—at a cost of \$15,000!! The equipment has just arrived and we are now able to set type—something we had previously been unable to do, without paying local businesses to do it for us. We can now set type for our books, tracts, manuscripts and each issue of *Reason & Revelation*. In addition, the equipment has magnetic card storage capabilities, so that everything we type can now be stored for future use, making revision easier than has ever been possible, and re-typing a thing of the past. We will shortly add additional typestyles, sizes, etc. to further enhance the appearance of each of our publications. Our thanks, not only to this doctor for his generous gift, but to all of you who have helped us financially in this work.