

Evidences For a Young Earth And Solar System

Compiled by Glen W. Chapman- December 2002

(Data From Book In The Beginning, 1995, By Walt Brown Ph.D., Center For Scientific Creation, Phoenix, AZ)

Strange Planets

Many undisputed observations contradict the current theories on how the Solar System evolved. One theory says planets formed when a star, passing near our sun, tore matter from the sun. More popular theories hold that the Solar System formed from a cloud of swirling gas, dust, or larger particles. If the planets and their 63 known moons evolved from the same material, they should have many similarities. After several decades of planetary exploration, this expectation is now recognized as false

Backward•Spinning Planets. All Planets should spin in the same direction, but Venus, Uranus, and Pluto rotate backwards.

Backward Orbits. All 63 moons in our Solar System should orbit their planets in the same sense, but at least six have backward orbits. Furthermore, Jupiter, Saturn, and Neptune have moons orbiting in both directions.

Inclined Orbits. The orbit of each of these 63 moons should lie in the equatorial plane of the planet it orbits, but many, including the earth's moon, are in highly inclined orbits,

Hydrogen and Helium. Since about 98% of the sun is hydrogen or helium, Earth, Mars, Venus, and Mercury should have similar compositions. Instead, much less than 1% of these planets is hydrogen or helium.

Angular Momentum. The sun should have 700 times more angular momentum than all the planets combined. Instead, the planets have 50 times more angular momentum than the sun,

Evolving Planets?

Contrary to popular opinion, planets should not form from the mutual gravitational attraction of particles orbiting the sun. Orbiting particles are much more likely to be scattered or expelled by their gravitational interactions than they are to be pulled together. Experiments have shown that colliding particles are much more likely to fragment than to stick together. Similar comments can be made concerning the improbability that particles orbiting a planet will ever grow into a moon. This is why the particles in the rings of Saturn, Jupiter, and Uranus show no evidence of clumping into larger bodies.

Despite these problems, let us assume that pebble-size to moon-size particles somehow evolved. "Growing a planet" by many small collisions will produce an almost **non-spinning** planet, since the spins imparted by impacts will be largely self-canceling. All planets spin, some much more than others.

Growing a large, gaseous planet (such as Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, or Neptune) far from the central star, is especially difficult for evolutionists to explain for several reasons.

a. Gases dissipate rapidly in the vacuum of outer space, especially the lightest two gases—hydrogen and helium, which comprise most of the giant planets.

b. Because gas molecules orbiting a star do not gravitationally pull in other gas molecules, a rocky planet, several times larger than the earth, must first form to attract all the gas

gravitationally. (The hydrogen and helium on Jupiter are more than 300 times as massive as the earth.) This must happen very quickly, before the gas dissipates.

c. Stars like our sun—even those which evolutionists say are young—do not have enough orbiting hydrogen or helium to form one Jupiter.

Based on demonstrable science, gaseous planets and the rest of the solar system could not evolve.

Origin of the Moon

Naturalistic theories on the moon's origin are highly speculative and completely inadequate. The moon did not spin off the earth, nor did it congeal from the same material as the earth since its orbital plane is too highly inclined. Furthermore, the relative abundances of its elements are too dissimilar from those of the earth. The moon's nearly circular orbit is also strong evidence that it was never torn from, nor captured by, the earth. If the moon formed from particles orbiting the earth, other particles should be easily visible inside the moon's orbit; none are. If the moon was not pulled or splashed from the earth, was not built up from smaller particles near its present orbit, and was not captured from outside its present orbit, only one hypothesis remains: the moon was created in its present orbit.

Evolution of the Solar System

Evolutionists claim the solar system condensed out of a vast cloud of swirling dust about 4.6 billion years ago. Many particles that were not swept up as part of a planet would have then begun a gradual spiral in toward the sun. Colliding asteroids also would create dust particles that, over millions of years, would spiral in toward the sun. (For an explanation of this spiral effect, Particles should still be falling into the sun's upper atmosphere, burning up, and giving off an easily measured, infrared glow. Measurements taken during the solar eclipse of 11 July 1991, showed no such glow. Therefore, the assumed "millions of years" and this explanation for the origin of the solar system are probably wrong.

Mountains of Venus

Venus must have a strong crust to support its extremely high, dense mountains. One mountain, Maat Mons, rises higher than Earth's Mount Everest does above sea level. Since Venus is relatively near the sun, its atmosphere is 90 ° F—so hot that its *surface* rocks must be weak or "tarlike." (Lead melts at 622 °F and zinc at 787 ° F.) Only if the *subsurface* rocks are cold and strong can these mountains defy gravity. This allows us to draw two conclusions, both of which contradict major evolutionary assumptions.

First, evolutionists assume that planets grew (evolved) by rocky debris falling from outer space, a process called *gravitational accretion*. The heat generated by the impacts of a planet's worth of projectiles would have left the inner planets molten. However, Venus was never molten. Had it been, its hot atmosphere would have prevented its subsurface rocks from cooling enough to support its mountains. Therefore, Venus did not evolve by gravitational accretion.

Secondly, evolutionists believe the entire solar system is billions of years old. If Venus were billions of years old, its atmospheric heat would have soaked deeply enough into the planet to weaken its subsurface rocks. Not only could Venus' crust not support mountains, the hot mountains themselves could not maintain their steep slopes.

Space, Time, and Matter

No scientific theory exists to explain the origin of space, time, or matter. Since each is intimately related to or even defined in terms of the other, a satisfactory explanation for the origin

of one must also explain the origin of the others. Naturalistic explanations have completely failed.

First Law of Thermodynamics.

The first law of thermodynamics states that the total amount of energy in the universe, or in any isolated part of it, remains constant. It further states that although energy (or its mass equivalent) can change form, it is not now being created or destroyed. Countless experiments have verified this. A corollary of the first law is that natural processes cannot create energy. Consequently, energy must have been created in the past by some agency or power outside and independent of the natural universe. Furthermore, if natural processes cannot produce the relatively simple inorganic portion of the universe, then it is even less likely that natural processes can explain the much more complex organic (or living) portion of the universe.

Second Law of Thermodynamics

If the entire universe is an isolated system, then, according to the second law of thermodynamics, the energy in the universe that is available for useful work has always been decreasing. However, as one goes back in time, the amount of energy available for useful work would eventually exceed the total energy in the universe that, according to the first law of thermodynamics, remains constant. This is an impossible condition, thus implying that the universe had a beginning.

A Beginning

Heat always flows from hot bodies to cold bodies. If the universe were infinitely old, the temperature throughout the universe should be uniform. Since the temperature of the universe is not uniform, the universe is not infinitely old. Therefore, the universe had a beginning.

Decay

A further consequence of the second law is that when the universe began, it was more organized and complex than it is today—not in a highly disorganized and random state as assumed by evolutionists and proponents of the big bang theory.

Big Bang?

Three observations led to the general acceptance of the big bang theory: the cosmic background radiation (CBR), the amount of helium in the universe, and the redshift of distant starlight. All three have been poorly understood.

CBR. All matter radiates heat, regardless of its temperature. Everywhere astronomers look, they can detect an extremely uniform radiation, called the cosmic background radiation (CBR). It appears to come from perfectly radiating matter whose temperature is 2.73^0 K—nearly absolute zero. The CBR was initially thought to be left over from the big bang. Many incorrectly believe that the big bang theory predicted this radiation.

Since the CBR is so uniform, the matter from which it originated must have been spread uniformly throughout the universe. But if matter was uniformly distributed, it would hardly gravitate in any direction; even after tens of billions of years, galaxies would not evolve. Since the matter in the universe is highly concentrated into galaxies, galaxy clusters, and superclusters, the CBR does not appear to be a remnant of a big bang!

Helium. The amount of helium in the universe is not explained by the big bang theory; the theory

was adjusted to fit the amount of helium. Ironically, the lack of helium in certain types of stars (B type stars) and the presence of beryllium in other stars contradicts the theory.

Red-shift. The red-shift of distant starlight is usually interpreted as a Doppler effect; namely, stars and galaxies are moving away from the earth, stretching out (or reddening) the wave lengths of light we see. While this may be true, other possible explanations do not involve an expanding universe. Besides, many objects with high red-shifts seem connected, or associated, with other objects of low red-shifts. They could not be traveling at such different velocities and be connected for long. For example, many quasars have very high red-shifts, and yet they statistically cluster with galaxies having low red-shifts. Sometimes, quasars appear to be connected to galaxies by threads of gas. Finally, red-shifted light from galaxies has some strange features that are inconsistent with the Doppler effect. If red-shifts are from objects moving away from the earth, one would expect the amount of red-shifting to take on continuous values. Instead, red-shifts tend to cluster at specific, evenly-spaced values. Much remains to be learned about red-shifts.

A big bang should neither produce highly concentrated nor rotating bodies. Galaxies are examples of both. A large volume of the universe should not be—but apparently is—moving sideways, almost perpendicular to the direction of expansion.

A big bang would, for all practical purposes, only produce hydrogen and helium. Therefore, the first generation of stars to somehow form after a big bang should consist of only hydrogen and helium. Some of these stars should still exist, but none can be found. These observations make it doubtful that a big bang occurred.

If a big bang occurred, what caused the bang? Stars with enough mass become black holes, so not even light can escape their enormous gravity. How then could anything escape the trillions upon trillions of times greater gravity caused by concentrating all the mass in the universe in a “cosmic egg” that existed before a big bang?

If the big bang theory is correct, one can calculate the age of the universe. This age turns out to be younger than objects in the universe whose ages were based on other evolutionary theories. Since this is logically impossible, one or both sets of theories must be incorrect.

Missing Mass

Imagine seeing several rocks in outer space, moving radially away from the earth. If the rocks were simultaneously blasted away from the earth, their masses, changing velocities, and distances from the earth would have a very precise relationship with each other. When a similar relationship is checked for billions of observable galaxies, an obvious conclusion is that these galaxies did not explode from a common point in a huge “big bang.” It is even more obvious that if such an explosion occurred, it must have been much, much less than billions of years ago.

Evolutionists try to fix this problem in two ways. They think the universe is filled with at least ten times as much matter as can be seen. This is maintained even though two decades of searching for this hidden mass has turned up nothing other than the conclusion that the needed “missing mass” does not exist.

A second “fix attempt” assumes that the rocks (or in the real problem, all the particles in the universe) were briefly, almost magically, accelerated away from some point. Supposedly, this matter reached speeds trillions of billions of times faster than the speed of light by an unknown, untestable phenomenon—not by a blast. Then this matter became controlled by gravity after it reached just the right speed to give it an apparent age of 10-20 billion years. Such flights of imagination and speculation are common in the field of cosmology.

Interstellar Gas

Detailed analyses indicate that neither stars nor planets could form from interstellar gas clouds. To do so, either by first forming dust particles or by direct gravitational collapse of the gas, would require vastly more time than the alleged age of the universe. An obvious alternative is that stars

and planets were created.

Fast Binaries

Perhaps half of all stars are grouped in closely spaced pairs called “binaries.” Fortunately, our sun does not have a binary partner. If it did, the wide range of temperatures on earth would probably not permit life. The mutual gravitational attraction between a binary pair of stars causes them to orbit each other, just as the moon orbits the earth. The closer the paired stars are, the more rapidly they orbit. Distances between a binary pair should not change appreciably, even over long periods of time.

Two particular stars have been found so close together that they orbit each other every eleven minutes! This implies that their centers are about 80,000 miles apart. By way of comparison, our sun, which is a typical star, is more than 800,000 miles in diameter. There are other close binaries.

The theory of stellar evolution was developed by arranging (on paper) different types of stars in a sequence according to their brightness and color. Stellar evolutionists believe that stars slowly change from one type to another. However, scientists have never been observed such changes, and some stars do not fit this pattern. According to stellar evolution, the volume of each star, late in its lifetime, expands to about a million times that of our sun. Finally, it supposedly collapses and becomes a small star about the size of the earth (a white dwarf) or even smaller (a neutron star).

Only such tiny stars could have their centers 80,000 miles apart and still orbit each other. Obviously, they did not evolve from larger stars, since larger stars orbiting so closely would collide. If two stars cannot evolve into a condition that has them orbiting each other every eleven minutes, one wonders whether stars evolve at all

Star Births?

If stars evolve, star births should about equal star deaths. The deaths of many stars are bright and sudden events called “supernovas.” Similarly, the birth of a star should be accompanied by the appearance of new star light when compared with the many photographic plates made decades earlier. Instruments, which could detect dust falling into and forming supposedly new stars, have not done so. Actually, the stars that some astronomers believe are very new are expelling matter. We have never seen a star born, but we have seen hundreds of stars die. There is no evidence that stars evolve nor are there any sound scientific explanations for how they could evolve.

Stellar Evolution?

Stellar evolution is assumed in estimating the age of stars. These age estimates are then used to establish a framework for stellar evolution. This is circular reasoning.

O Stars

The most luminous stars in our galaxy (the so-called ‘O’ stars) are “burning fuel” hundreds of thousands of times more rapidly than our sun. This is so rapid that they must be quite young on an evolutionary time scale. If these stars did evolve, they should show easily measurable characteristics such as extremely high rates of rotation and enormous magnetic fields. Since these characteristics are not observed, it seems quite likely these stars did not evolve.

Galaxies

There are good reasons why natural processes cannot form galaxies and why galaxies cannot evolve from one type to another. Furthermore, if spiral galaxies were billions of years old, their arms or bars would be severely twisted. Since they have maintained their shape, either galaxies are young, or unknown physical phenomena are occurring within galaxies. Even structures composed of galaxies are now known to be so amazingly large, and yet relatively thin, that they could not have formed by slow gravitational attraction. If *slow, natural* processes cannot form such huge galactic structures, then rapid, supernatural processes may have.

Techniques That Argue for an Old Earth Are Either Illogical or Are Based Unreasonable Assumptions.

Hidden Assumptions

To estimate a date prior to the beginning of written records, one must assume the dating clock has operated at a known rate, the initial setting of the clock is known, and the clock has not been disturbed. These assumptions are almost always unstated, overlooked, or invalid.

Corals and Caves

Estimated old ages for the earth are frequently based on “clocks” that today are ticking at very slow rates. For example, coral growth rates were for many years thought to be very slow, implying that some coral reefs must be hundreds of thousands of years old. More accurate measurements of these rates under favorable growth conditions now show us that no known coral formation need be older than 3,400 years. A similar comment can be made for the growth rates of stalactites and stalagmites in caves.

Constant Decay?

A major assumption that underlies all radioactive dating techniques is that the rates of decay, which have been essentially constant over the past 90 years, have also been constant over the past 4,600,000,000 years. This bold, critical, and un-testable assumption is made, even though no one knows what causes radioactive decay. Furthermore, two lines of evidence suggest radioactive decay was once much greater than it is today.

Radiometric Contradictions

The public has been greatly misled concerning the consistency and trustworthiness of radiometric dating techniques (the potassium-argon method, the rubidium-strontium method, and the uranium-thorium-lead method). For example, geologists hardly ever subject their radiometric age measurements to “blind tests. In science, such tests are a standard procedure for overcoming experimenter bias. Many published radiometric dates can be checked by comparisons with the assumed ages for the fossils that sometimes lie above, or below, radiometrically dated rock. In more than 400 of these published checks (about half of those sampled), the radiometrically determined ages were .at least one geologic age in error—indicating major errors in methodology. One wonders how many other dating checks were not even published because they, too, were in error.

Index Fossils

In the early 1800s, some observers in Western Europe noticed that certain fossils are usually preserved in sedimentary layers that, when traced laterally, typically lie above other types of

fossils. Decades later, after the theory of evolution was proposed, it was concluded that the upper organism must have evolved after the lower organism. These early geologists did not realize that there were hydro-dynamically sound reasons why, during the flood, the organisms were sorted in that order. Geologic ages were then associated with each of these “index fossils.” Those ages were extended to similar animals and plants based on the faulty reasoning that they must have evolved at about the same time since they were similar. Today, geologic formations are almost always dated by their fossil content—which, as stated above, assumes evolution. Yet, evolution is supposedly shown by the sequence of fossils. This reasoning is circular. Furthermore, it has produced many contradictory results.

Geologic Column

Practically nowhere on the earth can one find the so-called “geologic column.” At most places on the continents, over half the “geologic periods” are missing. Only 15-20% of the earth’s land surface has even one-third of these periods in the correct consecutive order. Even within the Grand Canyon, more than 150 million years of this imaginary column are missing. Using the assumed geologic column to date fossils and rocks is fallacious.

Old DNA

When an animal or plant dies, its DNA begins decomposing. Before 1990, almost no one believed that DNA would remain intact much beyond 10,000 years. This limit was based on measuring DNA disintegration rates in well-preserved specimens of known age such as Egyptian mummies. DNA has now been reported in magnolia leaves that evolutionists claim are 17 million years old.^o Fragments of DNA are also claimed to be in alleged 80 million-year-old dinosaur bones buried in a coal bed and in the scales of a 200 million-year-old fossilized fish. DNA is frequently reported in amber encased insects and plants that are supposedly 25-120 million years old. All this has forced evolutionists to reexamine the 10,000-year limit.

They now claim that DNA can be preserved longer if conditions are dryer, colder, and freer of oxygen, bacteria, and background radiation. The measured disintegration rates of DNA, apparently under these more ideal conditions, do not support this. Therefore, the previously measured rates were probably not several thousand times in error. If, as is likely, such a huge error is not found, then the method for arriving at those million-year ages needs reexamining.

Evolutionists have a similar problem with the protein preserved in dinosaur bones. As with DNA, no proteins should last 75-150 million years, as is claimed for those bones. [The best evidence suggests that these plant and animal remains are not as old as evolutionists believe.]

Human Artifacts

At various times and places, man-made objects have been found encased in coal. Examples include a thimble, a spoon, an iron pot, an iron instrument, an 8-carat gold chain, and a metallic vessel inlaid with silver. Many other “out of place artifacts” have been found inside deeply buried rocks: nails, a screw, a strange coin, a clay figurina, a strange hammer, and other objects of obvious human manufacture. By evolutionary dating techniques, these objects would be hundreds of millions of years older than man. Again, something is wrong.

Humanlike Footprints

Humanlike footprints, supposedly 150-600 million years old, have been found in rock formations in Utah, Kentucky, Missouri, and possibly Pennsylvania. At Laetoli, in the east African country of Tanzania, a team headed by Mary Leakey found a sequence of apparently modern human footprints. They were dated at 3.7 million

Parallel Layers

Since no worldwide or even continental unconformity exists in the earth’s sedimentary layers,

those layers must have been deposited rapidly. (An *unconformity* represents a time break of unknown duration—for example, an erosional surface between two adjacent strata.) Parallel layers (called conformities) imply that the deposition was continuous and rapid. Since unconformities are simply local phenomena, one can trace continuous paths from the bottom to the top of the geologic record that avoid these time breaks. The sedimentary layers along those paths must have been deposited rapidly and continuously as a unit.

For the last 130 years the age of the earth, as assumed by evolutionists, has been doubling at a rate of once every 20 years. In fact since 1900, their estimate of its age has multiplied by a factor of 100!

Evolution requires an old earth, an old solar system, and an old universe. Nearly all informed evolutionists will admit that without billions of years their theory is dead. Yet, by hiding the “origins question” behind a vast veil of time, the unsolvable problems of evolution become difficult for scientists to see and laymen to imagine. Our media and textbooks have implied for over a century that this almost unimaginable age is correct, but rarely do they examine the shaky assumptions and growing body of contrary evidence. Therefore, most people instinctively believe the earth and universe are old, and are disturbed (at least initially) to hear contrary evidence.

Actually, most dating techniques indicate that the earth and solar system are young—possibly less than 10,000 years old. Here are some of these points of evidence.

Helium

The radioactive decay of only uranium and thorium would produce all of the atmosphere’s helium in only 40,000 years. No known means exists by which large amounts of helium can escape from the atmosphere, even when considering helium’s low atomic weight. The atmosphere appears to be young.

Lead and Helium Diffusion

Lead diffuses (or leaks) from zircon crystals at known rates that increase with temperature. Since these crystals are found at different depths in the earth, those at greater depths and temperatures should have less lead. Even if the earth’s crust is just a fraction of the age claimed by evolutionists, measurable differences in the lead content of zircons should exist throughout the top 4,000 meters. Instead, no measurable difference is found. Similar conclusions are reached from a study of the helium contained in these same zircon crystals. In fact, these helium studies lead to a conclusion that the earth’s crust is less than 10,000 years old.

Excess Fluid Pressure

Abnormally high oil, gas, and water pressures exist within relatively permeable rock. If these fluids had been trapped more than 10,000 to 100,000 years ago, leakage would have dropped the pressure far below what it is today. This oil, gas, and water must have been trapped suddenly and recently.

Volcanic Debris

Volcanoes are ejecting almost a cubic mile of material into the atmosphere each year. This is so rapid that if the rate were constant, about 10 times the entire volume of the earth’s sediments should be produced in 4.6 billion years. Actually, only about 25% of the earth’s sediments are of volcanic origin, and many volcanic deposits show much greater volcanic activity in the past. No means have been proposed which can remove or transform all of this volcanic material. The earth’s sediments, therefore, appear to be much younger than 4.6 billion years old.

River Sediments

More than 27 billion tons of river sediments are entering the oceans each year. Probably, the rate of sediment transport was even greater in the past as the looser topsoil was removed and as

erosion smoothed out the earth's terrain. Even if erosion has been constant, the sediments now on the ocean floor would have accumulated in only 30 million years. No process has been proposed which can remove 27 billion tons of ocean sediments each year. Therefore, the oceans cannot be hundreds of millions of years old.

Continental Erosion

The continents are eroding at a rate that would level them in much less than 25 million years. However, evolutionists believe that fossils of animals and plants at high elevations have somehow avoided this erosion for more than 300 million years. Something is wrong.

Dissolved Metals

The rate at which elements such as copper, gold, lead, mercury, nickel, silicon, sodium, tin, and uranium are entering the oceans is very rapid when compared with the small quantities of these elements already in the oceans. There is no known means by which large amounts of these elements can come out of solution. Therefore, the oceans must be very much younger than a million years.

Shallow Meteorites

Meteorites are steadily falling onto the earth. Probably this rate was much greater in the past since planets have swept much of the original meteoritic material from the solar system. Experts have, therefore, expressed surprise that meteorites are found only in young sediments very near the earth's surface. Even meteoritic particles in ocean sediments are concentrated in the topmost layers. If the earth's sediments, which average about a mile in thickness on the continents, were deposited over hundreds of millions of years, as evolutionists believe, many iron meteorites should be buried well below the earth's surface. Since this is not the case, the sediments appear to have been deposited rapidly. Furthermore, since no meteorites are found immediately above the basement rocks on which these sediments rest, these basement rocks could not have been exposed to meteoritic bombardment for any great length of time. Similar observations can be made concerning ancient rock slides. Rock slides are frequently found on the earth's surface, but are generally absent from supposedly old rock.

Meteoritic Dust

Meteoritic dust is accumulating on the earth so fast that, after four billion years, the equivalent of more than 16 feet of this dust should have accumulated. Because this dust is high in nickel, the earth's crust should have an abundance of nickel. No such concentration has been found on land or in the oceans. Consequently, the earth appears to be young.

Magnetic Decay

Direct measurements of the earth's magnetic field over the past 140 years show a steady and rapid decline in its strength. This decay pattern is consistent with the theoretical view that there is an electrical current inside the earth which produces the magnetic field. If this is correct, then just 20,000 years ago the electrical current would have been so vast that the earth's structure could not have survived the heat produced. This implies that the earth could not be older than 20,000 years.

Molten Earth?

If the earth was initially molten, it would have cooled to its present condition in much less than 4.6 billion years. This conclusion holds even if one makes liberal assumptions about the amount of heat generated by radioactive decay within the earth. The known temperature pattern inside the earth is only consistent with a young earth.

Moon Recession

As tidal friction gradually slows the earth's spin, the laws of physics require the moon to recede from the earth. This recession has been observed since 1754. Even if the moon began orbiting near the earth's surface, the moon should have moved to its present distance in several billion years less time than the 4.6 billion-year age that evolutionists assume for the earth and moon. Consequently, the earth-moon system must be much younger than evolutionists assume.

Moon Dust and Debris

If the moon were billions of years old, it should have accumulated a thick layer of dust and debris from meteoritic bombardment. Before instruments were placed on the moon, some scientists were very concerned that astronauts would sink into a sea of dust—possibly a mile in thickness. This did not happen. Very little space dust is on the moon. In fact, after examining the rocks and dust brought back from the moon, scientists learned that only about 1/67th of the dust and debris came from outer space. Recent measurements of the influx rate of meteoritic material on the moon also do not support an old moon.

Crater Creep

A tall pile of tar will slowly flow downhill, ultimately spreading into a nearly horizontal sheet of tar. Most material, under moderate pressure, 'creeps' in this fashion, although some material, such as rock, deforms very, very slowly.

Calculations show that large, high-rimmed craters on the moon should flow downhill and level out in just several tens of thousands of years. Large, steep-walled craters exist even on Venus and Mercury, where gravity is greater, and temperatures are hot enough to melt lead. Most large craters on the moon, Venus, and Mercury are thought to have formed shortly after the solar system formed. These bodies appear to be quite young, since their craters show no sign of "creep."

Hot Moon

The moon has a hot interior. Since it has not yet cooled off, the moon is probably much less than a billion years old.

Young Comets

As comets pass near the sun, some of their mass vaporizes, producing a long tail and other debris. Comets also fragment frequently or fall into the sun, or other planets. Typical comets should disintegrate and disappear after several hundred orbits. For many comets this is less than 10,000 years. There is no evidence for a distant shell of cometary material surrounding the solar system, and there is no known way to add comets to the solar system at rates that even remotely balance their destruction. In fact, the gravitational attractions of the planets tend to expel comets from the solar system, rather than capture them. Consequently, comets and the solar system appear to be less than 10,000 years old.

Small Comets

Photographs, taken from earth-orbiting satellites, show small, ice-filled comets striking the earth's upper atmosphere at an average rate of one every twenty seconds. As each comet vaporizes, about 100 tons of water are added to the earth's atmosphere. If this began when evolutionists say the earth started to evolve, the earth's oceans should have several times more water than they now have. Actually, the rate of impact was probably greater in the past since the planets have swept many of these comets from the solar system. Therefore, the oceans and the earth look young.

Young Rings

The rings orbiting Saturn, Uranus, Jupiter, and Neptune are being rapidly bombarded by meteoroids. Saturn's rings, for example, should be pulverized and dispersed in about 10,000 years. Since this has not happened, planetary rings are probably quite young.

Hot Planets

Jupiter, Saturn, and Neptune each radiate away more than twice the heat energy they receive from the sun. Uranus and Venus also radiate too much heat. Calculations show that it is very unlikely that this energy comes from nuclear fusion, radioactive decay, gravitational contraction, or phase changes within those planets. The only other conceivable explanation is that these planets have not existed long enough to cool off.

Solar Wind

The sun's radiation applies an outward force on extremely small particles orbiting the sun. Particles less than 100,000th of a centimeter in diameter should have been "blown out" of the solar system if it were billions of years old. Yet these particles are still orbiting the sun. Conclusion: the solar system is young.

Poynting-Robertson Effect

A large disk-shaped cloud of dust particles orbits the sun. The forces acting on these particles are so great that they should be destroyed or removed in less than 10,000 years. Since there appears to be no significant source of replenishment, the solar system is probably less than 10,000 years old. One of these forces is called the Poynting-Robertson effect. Here is how it works.

Rain falling on a speeding car tends to strike the front of the car and slow it down slightly. Similarly, the sun's rays that strike particles orbiting the sun tend to slow them down. For particles larger than those described in Solar Wind (above), this effect is strong enough to cause them to spiral into the sun. Thus, the sun's radiation and gravitational field act as a giant vacuum cleaner that pulls in about 100,000 tons of micrometeoroids per day. The best estimates are that less than half this dust is being continuously supplied by the disintegration of comets and asteroids.

As a comet disintegrates, it becomes a cluster of particles called a meteor shower. The Poynting-Robertson effect causes the smaller particles in a meteor shower to spiral into the sun more rapidly than the larger particles. After about 10,000 years, this segregation of orbits by particle size should be visible. Since this segregation is generally not visible, meteor showers must be a relatively recent phenomenon.

Huge quantities of microscopic dust particles have also been recently discovered around some stars. Yet, according to the theory of stellar evolution, those stars are many millions of years old and should have blown the dust away. Unless one can demonstrate that some vast process continually supplies that dust, one should consider whether the "millions of years" are imaginary.

If the sun, when it first began to radiate, had any non-nuclear sources of energy, they would have been depleted in much less than ten million years. Theory and experiments indicate that nuclear reactions are not the predominant energy source for the sun. Our star, the sun, must therefore be young (less than ten million years old). If the sun is young, then so is the earth.

Shrinking Sun

Since 1836, more than one hundred different observers at the Royal Greenwich Observatory and the U.S. Naval Observatory have made direct, visual measurements that suggest that the sun's diameter is shrinking at a rate of about 0.1% each century or about five feet per hour. Furthermore, records of solar eclipses indicate that this rapid shrinking has been going on for at least the past 400 years. Several indirect techniques also confirm that the sun is shrinking,

although these inferred collapse rates are only about 1/7th as much. Using the most conservative data, one must conclude that had the sun existed several million years ago, it would have been so large that its heat would have destroyed life on earth. Yet, evolutionists say that a million years ago all the present forms of life were essentially as they are now, having completed their evolution that began a thousand million years ago.

During the last 30 years, one of the most perplexing problems in science has been the lack of solar neutrinos. Neutrinos are extremely light subatomic particles produced in nuclear reactions inside stars, including the sun. If all the sun's heat is produced by nuclear fusion, the earth should be bathed in three times as many neutrinos as scientists have consistently measured. However, if much of the sun's heat is due to its shrinking by gravitational collapse, then the lack of solar neutrinos would be explained.

Star Clusters

Stars moving in the same direction at significantly different speeds frequently travel in closely spaced clusters. This would not be the case if they had been traveling for billions of years because just a slight difference in their velocities would disperse them after such great periods of time. Similar observations have been made of galaxy and galaxy-quasar combinations that apparently have vastly different velocities yet appear to be connected.

Unstable Galaxies

Computer simulations of the motions of spiral galaxies show them to be highly unstable; they should completely change their shape in only a small fraction of the assumed evolutionary age of the universe. The simplest explanation for so many spiral galaxies, including our Milky Way Galaxy, is that they and the universe are much younger than has been assumed.

Galaxy Clusters

Hundreds of rapidly moving galaxies often cluster tightly together. Their individual velocities, as measured by the redshift of their light, are so high that these clusters should be flying apart. In other words, the visible mass of the entire cluster, is much too small to hold the galaxies together gravitationally. However, since the galaxies within clusters are so close together, they could not have been flying apart for very long.

A similar statement can be made concerning many stars in spiral galaxies and gas clouds that surround some galaxies. These stars and gas clouds are moving so rapidly that they should have broken their gravitational bonds long ago, if they were billions of years old. If the red-shift of starlight always indicates a star's velocity, then a 10-20 billion-year-old universe is completely inconsistent with what is observed. If red-shifts can be caused by phenomena other than a star's velocity, then much of current astronomical thinking is wrong.

Conclusion

All dating techniques, especially the few that suggest vast ages, presume that a process observed today has always proceeded at its present rate. This assumption may be grossly inaccurate. Projecting presently known processes far back in time is more likely to be in error than extrapolation over a much shorter time. For the many dating "clocks" that show a young earth and a young universe, a much better understanding usually exists for how they work.

This contrary evidence understandably disturbs those who have always been told the earth is billions of years old. Can you imagine how disturbing this evidence is to the confirmed evolutionist?

