

Pre-Fall cosmology

I have a comment about the *New Cosmology* article by John G Hartnett.¹ I've noticed a problem with every starlight theory creationists have, including Hartnett's new cosmology; they start with the assumption that the finished stars were sending out light, thus assuming that the stars started their journey to burning themselves out. Hartnett does admit there was probably something supernatural about how God originally got the light to earth (which provides no apologetic value), however, that supernatural quality should also hold for the behavior of light and stars until after Adam's fall.

The theories about light travel that do take into account Adam's fall only refer to the speed of light slowing down afterward but that's still missing a major problem. All theories assume that the light is a result of stars depleting themselves. So here people will start asking, 'How else can light be emitted without the star losing matter?' I suggest that we have an example in the Bible about this phenomenon, Moses' burning bush. In Exodus 3:1–3, it reads how the bush was on fire but did not burn up. I have no idea why this concept of burning but not consuming, as read in Exodus 3, never comes up in creation cosmology theories. Since scientists need formulas to work with, this idea obviously won't be popular, for what formula would you use to describe the chemical reactions that were taking place in the burning bush that wouldn't burn? What formulas and light speed equations do you put on something that is not bound to physical laws and behaviours? Yet this is clearly the situation the stars had to be in before the fall, burning without burning.

So now someone would ask, 'Why does it matter that the stars would burn themselves out?' This would mean that God had prepared the cosmos to destruction prior to Adam sinning. This may be plausible for the gang at *Reasons to Believe* but not for young

earth creationists. Had Adam gone a few billion years without sinning, he would have been faced with our suns destruction. Walt Brown in his article in *CRSQ*, 'What triggered the Flood?'² makes this profound statement,

'The Flood was **not inevitable** at that time [Creation Week]. In other words, the earth was not created with a "ticking time bomb". Nor was the universe created with



Photo by NASA

killer comets, asteroids, or meteors aimed at earth' [Emphasis added].

Clearly, this idea is extended to the life of stars as well. Maybe we need to have geologists writing cosmology theories.

Whatever the characteristic of light/matter was prior to Adam's fall, a physical/spiritual hybrid, no theories or formulas can start on the behaviour of light from distant stars until after Adam's fall.

Jeffrey Wilson
Florida

UNITED STATES of AMERICA

John Hartnett replies:

I disagree with the author. The theory I deal with does not focus on the mechanism for the source of light in the cosmos. It deals with the issue of the light getting to Earth in a very large universe. The author's whole argument hangs on the fact that he believes that if the light from stars is the result of hydrogen-helium fusion, then theories relating to this issue can only be valid after the Fall. Because the fuel in the stars must be eventually exhausted given sufficient time, in a perfect universe, before the Fall, such could not be the case. This view doesn't leave any room for God's

sustaining power, which if necessary could sustain stars as long as necessary. Who are we to judge the wisdom of God? Or how can we even presume to second-guess what God had in mind.

The author supplies the answer himself—the burning bush. Isn't this the result of God's sustaining power? Yes and he suggests this is the case before the Fall. So if he allows it to be true in that instance why not a combination of hydrogen fusion and God's sustaining power before the Fall. I never specified that starlight must only be the result of stars exhausting themselves of useable fuel. And what about our sun, how does light get to Earth from the nuclear sources at its centre when the time constant of the process to reach the surface is millions of years. The neutrinos make it out, so we know the process happens, but the light that is flooding the earth now and since Creation must be from just beneath the surface and provided by God's direct sustaining power.

This issue is closely related to the argument that supernovae are only possible in the universe after the Fall. I don't agree with that position. The issue is mis-stated. The universe was created for Man, and for the earth. We are the focus of God's attention. The objects in the cosmos are there for us, not the reverse. Therefore, a star going supernova says nothing about corruption, only that stars burn fuel and given sufficient time, some explode. The resulting matter is often visible from Earth and we get beautiful images of God's power in the cosmos. Also it looks like galaxies were created on Day 4 through a series of very large explosions in a sequence showing the mighty hand of God. There were many explosions then, maybe much greater than supernovae.

To believe that stars in the cosmos did not consume fuel prior to the Fall is to suppose also that Adam and Eve did not digest food prior to the Fall. At least one of the same laws of Physics is in operation in both cases—the Second Law of Thermodynamics—and a star is a much simpler system than Adam's

stomach.³

It is interesting that reference is made to Walt Brown and his article in *CRSQ*, 'What triggered the Flood', because even though he says, 'The Flood was **not inevitable** at that time ... the earth was not created with a "ticking time bomb".' He then goes on to explain under the heading 'Rupture Mechanisms', that the moon tides caused his subterranean waters to rupture via a heating mechanism. This is in fact, the 'ticking time bomb'. That heating was present before the Fall—Adam was digesting food before the Fall. Walt Brown, the mechanical engineer, invokes the 2nd Law himself to get this heating effect, through tidal friction. It continues to this present day. You can't have it both ways.

John Hartnett
Perth, WA
AUSTRALIA

References

1. Hartnett, J., A new cosmology: solution to the starlight travel time problem, *TJ* 17(2):98-102, 2003.
2. Brown, W., What triggered the Flood?, *CRSQ* 40(2):65-71, 2003
3. Sarfati, J., <answersingenesis.org/docs/370.asp>, downloaded 24 November 2003.