

- Southgate, D. A. T. (eds), 1991. McCance & Widdowson's The Composition of Foods, 5th edition, The Royal Society of Chemistry, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
3. Food composition tables for use in East Asia, FAO, Rome, 1972.
 4. Holland *et al.*, Ref. 2.
 5. Ref. 3.
 6. Chanarin, 1973. Dietary deficiency of vitamin B₁₂ and folic acid. *In*: Nutritional Deficiencies in Modern Society, A. N. Howard and I. N. Baird (eds), Newman Books, London, pp. 17–26.
 7. Rosenthal, H.L., 1968. Vitamin B₁₂:Deficiency effects in animals. *In*: The Vitamins, vol. II, 2nd edition, W.H. Sebrell and R.S. Harris (eds), Academic Press, New York.
 8. Smith, E. L., 1965. Vitamin B₁₂, 3rd edition, Methuen, London.
 9. Holland *et al.*, Ref. 2.
 10. Holland *et al.*, Ref. 2.
 11. Chanarin, ref. 6.
 12. Stewart, J. S., Roberts, P. D. and Hoffbrand, A. V., 1970. *Lancet*, 1970 (2):542–545.
 13. Davidson, S., Passmore, R., Brock, J. F. and Trueswell, A. S., 1979. Human Nutrition and Dietetics, 7th edition, Churchill Livingstone, Edinburgh.

MOON DUST

Dear Editor,

Your article 'Moon dust and the age of the solar system'¹ disappointed me on three counts as follows.

- (1) Why are there omitted references to the influx to earth of micrometeorites in quantities greater than Pettersson's 14 million tons per annum, such as:—
 - * McCracken, C. W., Alexander W. M. and Dubin, M., 1967. Direct measurement of the mass distribution and time variations in the flux of small particles. *In*: Hawkins, G.S. (ed.), **Meteor Orbits and Dust**, NASA, Washington D.C., pp. 259-270 (214 million tons per annum).
 - * Nazarova, T. N. *et al.*, 1958. Rocket and satellite investigations of meteors. **Comite Speciale de l'Anne Geophysique International**, Moscow (290-365 million tons per annum).
 - * Cassidy, W. A., 1964. Cosmic dust. *Science*, **144**: 1475-1477 (Ocean sediment analysis — 365 million tons per annum; Low altitude atmospheric sampling — 2400 million tons per annum).
- (2) In the important issue of the focussing factor in the conversion of earth influx to the corresponding moon influx, it is quite inadequate to state that the moon's smaller surface area apparently is irrelevant (p. 27), without giving reasons why this is so. Can a reference be supplied where these reasons are set out?
- (3) In the presentation, the evolutionists' case is **apparently** supported from observed data, but no statement is made that this can only be illusory, in the light of so much other evidence for a young solar system.

Otherwise the article gives a wise warning to creationists on moon dust.

C.L. Prasher,
Brighton, East Sussex,
UNITED KINGDOM.

The Authors reply ...

First, thanks for bringing those additional three references to our attention. We missed those in our survey of the literature, which was nonetheless already fairly extensive. There is a limit to how many papers one has to look at before reaching some sort of conclusion on an issue. In any case, there was no bias on our part to ignore results greater than Pettersson's figure. However, the emphasis had to be on more recent results that superseded earlier estimates. Indeed, it can be shown that for each of the three references you supply and the estimates they present there are more recent papers with more recent determinations using the same measurement method in each case. All of the more recent determinations by each method give figures lower than Pettersson's estimate and the estimates in the three papers you cite. Again, the omission of those three papers had nothing to do with any bias, but was merely because we didn't have those papers to add into our treatment of the influx measurements.

Readers will be interested to know that just to hand is a paper in which two U.S. scientists claim a direct measurement of the earth's cosmic dust influx.² From examination of hyper-velocity impact craters on the space-facing end of the Long Duration Exposure Facility satellite, they calculated an influx rate of 40,000 (±20,000) tonnes per year of dust particles in the range 10⁻⁹ to 10⁻⁴ grams. This result only serves to reinforce the earth influx rate we reported in our paper, and hence the lunar influx rate.

On the issue of the focussing factor in the conversion of the earth influx to the corresponding moon influx, there was no intention to give the impression that we were glossing over why the moon's smaller surface area appeared to be irrelevant. It appeared to us from all the references we had before us that the scientists concerned did not take into account the size differences between the earth's and the moon's surface areas when doing their calculations. Thus this is the reason for our saying that this factor appeared to be irrelevant. We could find no explanations for this and hence the reason why we did not set any out. As for references, all we could point to would be all those references where authors likewise ignore the moon's smaller surface area in their calculations. We had no reason to question why all these authorities considered the moon's smaller surface area as being irrelevant.

Finally, we thought we had said enough to imply that the observed data only apparently supported the evolutionists' case. Perhaps we needed to make a stronger comment lest we be misunderstood. There is no way that we want to leave the impression that the moon dust provides evolutionists with evidence for their claimed age for the moon—such is certainly not the case, even with their false uniformitarian

assumption. Yes, there is much other evidence for a young solar system, and that is why we strongly suggest that creationists rely on all that other evidence for a young solar system, rather than bringing discredit to our cause by still relying on the moon dust argument, which has now been shown to be faulty according to our current knowledge.

Andrew A. Snelling,
Brisbane, Queensland,
AUSTRALIA.

REFERENCES

1. Snelling, A. A. and Rush, D. E., 1993. Moon dust and the age of the solar system. CEN Tech. J., 7(1):2–42.
2. Love, S. G. and Brownlee, D.E., 1993. A direct measurement of the terrestrial mass accretion rate of cosmic dust. Science, 262 (5133):550–553.

‘LIFE’ ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE

Dear Editor,

I read with great interest Mr Stambaugh’s article, “‘Life’ according to the Bible, and the scientific evidence”.¹ I agree with his premise that God created the world void of death and decay; these are manifestations of the consequences of sin.

However, I did find it curious that Mr Stambaugh chose not to include a substantial biblical proof text. God promises Noah that:—

‘For after seven more days, I will send rain on the earth forty days and forty nights; and I will blot out from the face of the land every living thing that I have made.’
(NASB, Genesis 7:4)

Verse 23 tells us that God made good on His word, fulfilling His promise, and even tells us what the group called ‘every living thing’ consists of;

‘Thus He blotted out every living thing that was on the face of the land, from man to animals to creeping things and to birds of the sky, and they were blotted out from the earth; and only Noah was left, together with those that were with him in the ark.’

(NASB, Genesis 7:23)

Of all the living things that God had made and allowed to multiply ‘after its kind’, only those aboard the ark survived. Clearly, then, the ‘freshly picked olive leaf’ the dove brought to Noah in Genesis 8:11, whether from a seedling or regenerated growth from the remains of an antediluvial olive tree, does not fall into the category of ‘every living thing on the face of the earth’. Were it (and all the other vegetation that grew after the Flood waters receded) living, in the sense that eating them cause their

death, then either:—

- (1) God would have had to perform another act of special creation in order to produce the tree from which the olive leaf came; or
- (2) God did not really blot out every living thing from the face of the earth. He only thought He did, mistakenly of course, since His Word does say He destroyed **every** living thing.

Preposterous! Any supposition that says plants are among those things to which God gave life is at odds with Scripture and must have been arrived at by employing specious exegetical principles. God created the vegetation to be the sustenance for every living thing He created — Genesis 1:29; Genesis 9:2–3. Only after the fall of man did suffering, death, and decay come about.

Thank you for putting out a wonderful journal. While I am naive regarding many of the technical details, the material is adequately documented to facilitate the reader’s investigations into the subject matter.

May our God and Saviour richly bless you as you continue to participate in the Gospel of Christ.

Larry W. Jones,
Callam Way, Wichita,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCE

1. Stambaugh, J., 1992. ‘Life’ according to the Bible, and the scientific evidence. CEN Tech.J., 6(2):98–121.

SPEED OF LIGHT

Dear Editor,

Amnon Goldberg, like myself, is no doubt disappointed that Dr Jay L. Wile’s ‘Time dependent measurement of the speed of light’¹ seems to knock out (for the time being at least for nothing is certain in science) any reliance upon light decay as an explanation of a young universe and early conditions on earth.

Although a non-technical person, I would like to deal with some of the arguments that might be raised against an alternative creationist view that in the beginning God created all the light streams in the universe supernaturally when He commanded, ‘Let there be light’ (Genesis 1:3).

First of all, Hubble’s distance ‘law’ purports that because of the (alleged) time light has taken to reach earth from distant and not so distant galaxies, we are seeing them as they appeared billions of light years ago. Leaving aside the question of distance (which is a separate problem scientists have) does not this imply that light waves or