

Solar system formation by accretion has no observational evidence

I would like to comment on Jonathan Henry's recent report on the subject of accretion disks in issue 24(2).¹

It was most illuminating to see that computer models used to simulate planet origins in dust disks or accretion disks have all sorts of problems growing from dust grains to objects larger than 1 meter in size. The report does raise the question how astronomy committed to the big bang and accretion disk theory can explain the presence of more than 470 exoplanets documented now. If accretion of dust disk around stars does not form planets, it would seem the answer(s) are in vain.

In the PDF attachment supplied, five exoplanets show observational evidence of orbiting their host stars in dust disks. Evolutionists would claim this is observational evidence for the accretion disk theory.

Q: Do these exoplanet observations in dust disks pose a challenge to the conclusion reached in this report, namely that the heavenly bodies must be explained by a supernatural event vs that these exoplanet observations support the accretion disk theory?

Rod Bernitt
Upper Marlboro, MD
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

1. Henry, J., Solar system formation by accretion has no observational evidence, *J. Creation* 24(2):87–94, 2010.

Jonathan Henry replies:

Mr Bernitt has raised a good question but it is one already answered in the accretion paper to which he refers. Exoplanets need not have formed by accretion any more than

planets within our solar system. The fallacies with accretion discussed in the accretion paper are general and are not confined to alleged planetary formation in only our solar system.

Citing the existence of exoplanets as confirmation of accretion is a mistake. Exoplanets exist, but their mode of formation is an inference. Existence neither confirms nor denies an inference about past formation.

So how do we arrive at whether a formation inference is valid? As the accretion paper discusses, the solar system and the larger universe show definite symptoms of material dissolution rather than coalescence. Therefore, the existence of exoplanets in dust around stars can logically be taken as consistent with the dust forming as a dissolution product. This is discussed in the original paper.

If one wishes to continue to *see* the accretion of exoplanets in the dust around stars, he of course can do so, but he should not confuse this inference with observation. As the original paper documents, there are no observations of actual contraction or accretion of matter into celestial bodies.

As a recent *fiat* creationist, I realize that from a scientific point of view, the claim that God spoke celestial bodies into existence—including exoplanets—is also an inference which I choose to make. But the facts that (1) the universe exhibits signs of dissolution, (2) there are no actual observations of contraction or accretion into larger bodies, and (3) in the Bible the original Hebrew signifies *fiat* creation rather than a process of God's having 'used' a suite of 'natural processes' to accomplish the creation, all combine to make the inference of recent *fiat* creation a reasonable one.

As the original paper discusses, though science cannot absolutely confirm or deny any inference, biblical revelation can. By asserting a recent *fiat* creation, a long, gradual formation of celestial bodies is denied and *fiat* creation remains as the only viable alternative. Reading-in other views into Genesis is eisegesis and while

it may ostensibly allow one to be a 'Bible-believing' Christian and an evolutionist simultaneously, such a position is not a valid hermeneutic based on the original Hebrew wording in Genesis.

Jonathan F. Henry
Clearwater, FL
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

CPT explains the rapid sea level drop in the latter portion of the Flood

In his article in *Journal of Creation* 25(1) dealing with the proper location of the Flood/post-Flood boundary, Michael Oard raises the extremely important issue of cause for the rapid sea level drop during the latter portion of the Flood. He correctly observes that the massive apron of sediment, mostly below sea level today, on the margins of all the continents, otherwise known as the continental shelf, represents sediment stripped from the continent interiors during the runoff stage of the Flood. I am persuaded that Oard is correct in concluding that the vast majority of the erosion and deposition of the continental shelf sediments occurred during the year of the Flood and not afterward. I concur with him that this implies a dramatic and rapid reduction in the global sea level relative to the mean height of the continental surface to allow such rapid runoff to occur. A crucial issue, of course, is the mechanism responsible for such a rapid reduction in sea level. Oard claims that catastrophic plate tectonics (CPT) offers only the cooling and thermal contraction of 2 km of seafloor basalt to account for this reduction in sea level, which, of course is woefully insufficient. Is this an accurate representation of the CPT understanding of these events?