

READERS' FORUM

Dr. Ross answers questions on the creation

The following letter was sent on June 16, 2000 to Dr. Hugh Ross. The author of the letter is by Frank Gauna of Santa Clarita, California.

Dear Dr. Ross,

Could you be so kind as to briefly elaborate your views with respect to the following four questions? I've attached a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience in sending a reply. I understand that your answers reflect your views based on your personal research and the work of the scientific/theological community at large.

Q. What is the estimated age of the universe?

A. 14.5 billion years.

Q. How do you apportion the seven individual days of Genesis throughout this period of time? Perhaps you could indicate below where you conceive the divisions might be drawn chronologically (*e.g.*, 4000M= 4 billion years ago; 40K= 40,000 years ago, etc.):

A.

DAY 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
~4B			~0.5B	~0.25B	~5M	~40K

Q. What is the estimated time of Adam's creation?

A. Best biblical date: 10,000-60,000 years ago.
Best scientific date: 20,000-50,000 years ago.

Q. According to the fossil record, what is the earliest time that proto men (Neanderthal, Cro-Magnon, etc.) appear in earth history?

A. [Cro-Magnon] no longer used, Cro-Magnon are humans. Neanderthal: 150,000-30,000 years ago; Homo Habilis & Homo Erectus: 1.1 million-0.6 million; Australopithicene: 4.4 million-2.9 million; nothing previous to Australopithicenes. See *The Genesis Question* for details.

According to a representative of Reasons to Believe, Dr. Hugh Ross believes the following about Genesis 1:1-2:

GENESIS 1:1 covers the entire period from the Big Bang up until the creation of the earth. The time span would be from ~14.5¹² billion years to ~4.5 billion years ago. The fact that the earth is mentioned in verse one does not mean that the First Day of Creation commences there. “In The Beginning” does not mean that the heaven and the earth were created at the same time.

GENESIS 1:2 is the official beginning of the First Day of Creation, when God begins to fashion the earth.

More on the lunar landing hoax theory

The matter of whether or not men actually went to the moon surfaces in correspondence from time to time. It has served to show that Christians can be every bit as gullible as unbelievers. (One will argue which set of Christians is the gullible set, of course.) So here’s a brief exchange with Mr. S., starting with my reply to his asking me for my opinion.

I’ve been following the moon hoax since Fidel Castro first claimed the lunar landing was a hoax in 1969. I’ve read the claims by Percy and Renee, et al., and find myself in a position able to determine the validity of their claims because I started developing and printing my own black and white photos in 1959, color slides in 1963, and color prints in 1964. Furthermore, I worked in a portrait studio from 1965-1966 where I learned about “burning in” overexposed areas and “dodging” underexposed areas, both to bring out details. Furthermore, I know the basic algorithms used to enhance photos by computer and have done it myself for nigh onto 15 years now, restoring old photos, both black and white and color.

Having said that, I can unreservedly state that when it comes to picture contrast, lighting, and quality, there is not a single “error” claimed by Renee, Percy, and others that is not the result of any of the techniques I mentioned in the previous paragraph. They are the result of experienced photographic printers (people) who know how to get the highest quality prints and, being conscientious of the historic nature of the prints, use the techniques to advantage. Had they not used the techniques to produce the best quality prints, it would be a shame and a sham.

I have video of every one of the Apollo landings, and have examined each, sometimes frame by frame, for evidence both that they were filmed in an atmosphere instead of a vacuum and that they were filmed

¹² The symbol ~ means “approximately” and is usually read as “about.”

under terrestrial gravitational conditions instead of lunar ($1/6$ earth gravity). The evidence is entirely consistent with the conditions expected in a vacuum under $1/6$ g. Note that Renee et al. have not come up with a single claim on these two most major counts.

As for the remaining claims, most deal with topography and are of dubious significance. I have not found a single claim of any substance. I have found that the hoax advocates do not do their homework, however, such as the "C" rock (said to be a stage prop mark). The C is not present on prints made from the original negative except one, which was widely circulated by NASA and is even on their web site. Looking closely, the C is either a hair or a piece of lint; it even casts a shadow.



I've attached the highest-resolution photo I've obtained. Note, too, that the C is a different color (brown) than the rock. (Receives of the electronic version can see it.)

As you found out, [by their rejection of geocentricity in the same off-handed way as ICR has done—*Ed.*] the hoax advocates are not at all interested in promoting truth; all they care about is their cash cow, for these two men have become millionaires selling their own hoax, and they know that theirs is the hoax, not NASA's.

To this, Mr. S. replied with these words:

Although I can see that the moon hoax people are adamant about their issue, that it is, as you called it, their “cash cow,” in their defense I must say a lot of puzzling photos exist. And for all of them, how does the film they use escape the heat, cold, and radiation effects?

As for the 1/6th gravity, how is it that no astronaut ever showed us how high that would allow them to jump? Even the dust flying off the wheels of the Lunar Rover flies no higher up than a dune buggy in the sand here on Earth.

I guess it seems to me the Apollo hoaxers make some very plausible, good points.

Thank you for conversing with me about this.

And my reply:

About the protection of the film: The camera was stored in a shielded box en route. Are you saying that one can't take pictures at the south pole because it's too cold for the film? The film in the camera does not need to be shielded from the heat because only the very edges of the film would heat up at all. We used to bake film for several hours at 200 deg. F. to sensitize it for astronomical use, and you couldn't tell that it had been heated.

As for radiation effects, you would need to look at the original negatives with a microscope to find that evidence. It's not like on earth where cosmic rays cause showers with particles hitting other particles, which hit other air atoms until many particles hit the ground. There is no air on the moon, so no cosmic ray showers.

About the 1/6th gravity: On the moon, the astronauts seem to jump about three feet, at most. If you were in one of those bulky space suits, with limited flexibility, doesn't it seem reasonable that the highest you could jump is six inches? How many of us could jump two or three feet with little more than the spring in our legs?

The sand of the “dune buggy” kicks up to two or three times the diameter of the wheel at times. How high does a dune buggy speeding along at 12 to 15 miles per hour kick up sand here on earth? And water-laden terrestrial soil is much heavier than the lunar soil.

Now here's one for you: when you drive down a dirt road, how long does it take the dust to fall to the ground? The dust in the films falls immediately; in the same amount of time it takes the sand to fall.

About the very plausible, good points: Hey, they couldn't con people if that weren't true.

Hello Prof. Bouw,

I am struggling with how we get day and night every 24 hours if the earth is fixed and the sun is 93 million miles out moving with the universe. The 24 hour day is what I have trouble visualizing. Could you please explain this in detail?

Seriously confused,
Doug

Dear Doug,

Imagine a basketball on the center post of a carousel. Paint a white spot on it somewhere on the equator of the ball. Imagine that the post does not rotate with the merry-go-round but is fixed to the ground, so that the basketball will not rotate relative to the ground.

Now stand among the horses of the merry-go-round and shine a flashlight (representing the sun) on the ball (the earth). Start the carousel. You'll see that half the time the flashlight will shine on the white spot (corresponding to day time), and the other half of the time it will shine on the backside of the ball but not on the spot, which means it's now night at the spot. The platform of the merry-go-round represents the universe, which carries the sun with it. The ground, on which the merry-go-round is based, represents the third heaven, and the ball will not rotate relative to it, but the platform, horses, and flashlight all rotate around the central axis where the ball is fixed.

Dear Dr. Bouw,

In the latest *Biblical Astronomer* (summer 2002), Dr. Bolton Davidheiser discusses the work of Dr. Hugh Ross. On p. 114, he summarizes what H. D. B. Kettlewell wrote about his experiments, with some thoughtful responses to the significance of that research. This summer, science writer Judith Hooper published *Of Moths and Men*, a book on Kettlewell and his work, which points out serious problems with the work (finally criticized by scientists) and puts it perspective.

A good brief summary by Paul Raeburn is in the August 25, 2002 *New York Times*, section 7, column 3, page 12. Or go to <http://www.nytimes.com> and search under "Of Moths and Men" or "Paul Raeburn."

Keep up the good work!

Many Blessings!
Christian

The following is from a 4-way email exchange. My replies to individual questions are in bold face.

Dr Bouw,

Is it true that Tycho believed, as did Copernicus, that Earth is a planet — is one of the “heavenly bodies”?

No.

... Final question: Would you call a cosmological “system” a “model”? I’m not sure if there’s a difference. It has been claimed that the [heliocentric] H-model can predict the exact locations & movements of the planets.

Since we can’t go out in space to test cosmological models, they’re all models. To talk of a cosmological “system” is to talk epistemologically, as far as I can see.

It has also been claimed that there is no such thing as a [geocentric] G-model which can achieve such results.

Wrong. Geocentricity and the Machian model can both achieve the movement of the planets, and all other observed effects.

I’m not sure where I’d look to find either an H-model or a G-model, but perhaps the allegation is that astronomers can make those loci predictions by using laws of physics accepted only by heliocentrists.

At www.geocentricity.com there is a list of references, each of which demonstrates how the G-model can satisfy the observations without violating the laws of physics.

Do you know if geocentrists reject some of the laws of physics accepted by heliocentrists?

I don’t know of any geocentrists which reject the laws of physics.

If both groups accept the same laws, then it would seem that both groups could make the same claim -- that their “model” can make those loci predictions/calculations with the same degree of accuracy, since both would be using the identical math.

True, and I sometimes do so to make a point that if one is "proven," then the other is, too.

In Christ, P. E.

From Jack A. we have the following contribution in response to the first question in the above exchange:

The question of Brahe's theory is not so simply rejected as purely heliocentric. See the discussion below from

http://es.rice.edu/ES/humsoc/Galileo/People/tycho_brahe.html.

If Tycho destroyed the dichotomy between the corrupt and ever changing sublunary world and the perfect and immutable heavens, then the new universe was clearly more hospitable for the heliocentric planetary arrangement proposed by Nicholas Copernicus in 1543. Was Tycho therefore a follower of Copernicus? He was not.

Tycho gave various reasons for not accepting the heliocentric theory, but it appears that he could not abandon Aristotelian physics which is predicated on an absolute notion of place. Heavy bodies fall to their natural place, the Earth, which is the center of the universe. If the Earth were not the center of the universe, physics, as it was then known, was utterly undermined.

On the other hand, the Copernican system had a number of advantages, some technical (such as a better lunar theory and smaller epicycles),¹³ and others more based on harmony (an obvious explanation of retrograde planetary motion, a strict demonstration of the order and heliocentric distances of the planets). Tycho developed a system that combined the best of both worlds. He kept the Earth in the center of the universe, so that he could retain Aristotelian physics (the only physics available). The Moon and Sun revolved about the Earth, and the shell of the fixed stars was centered on the Earth. But Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn revolved about the Sun. He put the (circular) path of the comet of 1577 between Venus and Mars. This Tyconic world system became popular early in the seventeenth century among those who felt forced to reject the Ptolemaic arrangement of the planets (in which the Earth was the center of all motions) but who, for various reasons, could not accept the Copernican alternative.

Jack

¹³ This is challenged by Philip Stott in the *Biblical Astronomer Technical Paper No. 2*. The book is available for \$7.00 postpaid in N. America, \$12 elsewhere.

A fourth party, David L., responded to a fifth party with this:

Brahe was geocentric as the outline above supports. Interesting discussion, though.

Einstein maintained that there cannot be a determination between Ptolemy or Copernicus as to whom is correct (Ptolemy tying into the Bible); and it just depends how you wish to arrange your coordinate system. It can be as easily centered on the earth as on the sun, and that is what relativity is all about.

It is surprising that this is not taught in the classrooms, as it shows the Bible has not been disproven in its geocentric astronomy, even as it has not been disproven on the age of the earth being less than 6,000 years, or that man was created rather than evolved. In each case there were no historical observations made to counter the Biblical account, as no man was there.

There is an interesting book entitled *Omphalos* by Philip H. Gosse, (omphalos means in Greek the belly button), asking the question as to whether Adam had a belly button.

He writes on page 124: "But the whole organisation of the creature thus newly called into existence, looks back to the course of an endless circle in the past. Its whole structure displays a series of developments, which as distinctly witness to former conditions as do those which are presented in the cow, the butterfly, and the fern, of the present day. But what former conditions? The conditions thus witnessed unto, as being necessarily implied in the present organization, were non-existent; the history was a perfect blank till the moment of creation. The past conditions or stages of existence in question (such as the circles in the trunk of a tree indicating its age, editor), can indeed be as triumphantly inferred by legitimate deduction from the present, as can those of our cow or butterfly; they rest on the very same evidences; they are identically the same in every respect, except in this one, that they were unreal. They exist only in their results; they are effects which never had causes (in a natural sense, it being acknowledged that God created the earth and everything in it that way in six days, as the first cause, editor)."