

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”.<sup>1</sup> 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’<sup>1</sup> 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

particles now reaching earth carry photo-images of their sources?

The vision we see of the stars is surely one affected by perspective. But how could perspective operate to reduce such a photo-image of a star at its source — during its light travel journey to earth — to one of a star as it appears to an earthly viewer?

Any observer on earth taking an outdoor photograph of an earthly scene would ensure that the sun was at his back: in which case the light waves or particles would flow from the direction of the observer to the object being photographed and not vice versa as in the case of those flowing from stars to earth. A good photograph therefore does not depend upon a flow of light waves or particles from the earthly scene to the camera, but rather depends on the maximum illumination of that object by the natural light, flowing, if anything, towards it.

It is said by some scientists that wider telescopes give a better view of the stars, and they reason that this is because they catch more light waves or particles. However, it would seem to me that a star's light waves or particles caught by the lens of a telescope would be extremely minute when compared to the whole range of light waves or particles emitted from that star, or even compared to the total number thereof reaching earth.

If one were to train a telescope upon the summer sun at midday — assuming that the sun could be viewed by using filters — the picture seen would be that of the ball of the sun emitting light waves or particles in all directions, most of which would not be in the direction of the earth.

It therefore seems to me that as we look towards the sun or any other star, either with the naked eye or through a telescope, our sight encompasses not only an ever-increasing spread of light waves or particles but also the source thereof, the object star; but at the same time our sighting is diminished by the perspective associated with the distance the star is from us.

Thus upon the above reasoning the factors that determine what vision from earth we have of a star is the intensity of its base luminosity, which is normally associated with size, and its distance from the earth, which will govern perspective.

Of course, telescopes can contract the viewing distance and so stars that cannot be seen with the naked eye can be detected.

**At best** therefore the light waves or particles caught by the naked eye or telescopes may only serve as a conduit whereby we may view the stars, and thus in the final analysis we only see such stars because of their base luminosity and their sufficient proximity to the earth, having regard to the intensity of that luminosity.

Such a view would seem to offer no 'scientific' problems for instant (supernatural) creation of light streams, when light was created by God, and would also seem to bring into question Hubble's distance 'law'. However, as I am someone who knows nothing at all about optics I

realise that it could be a naive view and therefore would welcome any critical comment concerning it.

An associated problem for many is that God created light before He made the sun and the stars. Here modern scientific observations could perhaps provide an explanation of how God did this.

Scientific writer, John Gribben has stated:

*'Stars form today in clouds of gas and dust in space, where chemical reactions that take place on the surface of carbon dust grains cool the clouds and encourage them to collapse.'*<sup>2</sup>

While this is no doubt interpretation of observations rather than scientific fact, it nevertheless points to a possible way whereby God might have proceeded to create the universe: that is, He might have created many luminous (light-giving) clouds on the First Day and formed them into the sun and other stars on the Fourth Day.

Even if this explanation is not the true one, we should not, of course, question the revealed truth of what God actually did during Creation Week merely because His *supernatural* acts are incomprehensible to our limited human understanding. Furthermore, we must remember that 'with God nothing is impossible'.

Clem Butel,  
Pymble, New South Wales,  
AUSTRALIA.

## REFERENCES

1. Wile, J. L., 1993. Time independent measurement of the speed of light. CEN Tech. J., 7(1):88-92.
2. Gribben, John, 1992. New Scientist, 1 February 1992 (cf. evolution of the universe by natural selection).

---

## LIVING DINOSAURS

**Dear Editor,**

Thanks to Bill Cooper for an outstanding and fascinating article, 'The early history of man — Part 4. Living dinosaurs from Anglo-Saxon and other early records.'<sup>1</sup> I have comments on two of the figures from the article.

Considering Figure 2(b), we don't give the ancients enough credit: the mammary glands on this carnivorous dinosaur were probably real. Many creationists are convinced that the Hebrew word '*tannim*' refers to dinosaurs, as postulated by Dr Henry Morris in **The Biblical Basis for Modern Science**.<sup>2</sup> Modern translations often use 'jackal', but since jackals can interbreed with dogs, it is likely that the Hebrew word for dog would be used when referring to them.<sup>3</sup> Until the rise of evolution, biblical scholars seem to