



The Tri-Cities Edifier

Volume 10

November 3, 2024

No. 44

How Did the Earth Get Its Moon?

Jim Jonas

The above title headlines an article on Earth.com. Subtitle: “A new theory has emerged.” Uh oh, here we go again. As predictably as the sun rising in the east each morning, “scientific” articles are frequently filled with assumptions and speculations. This one is no different. The problem is that many will read such baseless nonsense without scrutiny and think, “Since this is a scientific (website/journal/documentary) there must be some factual basis behind it.” This is the fictional aura science has created for itself: scientists are unbiased, intellectual, fact-driven researchers who dispassionately study the world and the universe and objectively report their findings. This is a myth that needs to be exposed. It got us into trouble during the Covid crisis, but I doubt many learned the lesson.

First, some disclaimers. Bible-believers are not anti-science; they are excited to study and learn about their physical environment, for they know its divine origin and constantly marvel at the truth about it. But *it is truth* they insist on, unafraid that scientific facts and Biblical accounts will conflict. The real conflict arises with secular scientists who insist on skewing data to fit their naturalist narrative.

This leads to the second observation: Scientific theories and postulations are always in flux, even as the article mentioned demonstrates. Yet we are constantly badgered into giving unquestioned credence to the latest theories and pronouncements as if they are carved in stone. Proponents want us to continue to revere scientists even while they consistently posit theories that are debunked and clash over studies and research. This is not a knock on science itself, for this is the “scientific method” in action, and thoughtful believers recognize that. The rub comes in pretending that “science” is some monolithic version of reality that cannot be questioned because of the myth of academic integrity.

The third observation is that science arrogantly considers itself – not God – to be the savior of humanity. This in large measure explains the hostility of science toward religion. As John Lennox writes in his book *Can Science Explain Everything?*: “(Scientists) view themselves as the voice of reason. They believe they are working to roll back the tide of ignorance and superstition that has enslaved mankind since we crawled out of the primeval slime. If I can summarize their position, it is this: *Science is an unstoppable force for human development that will deliver answers to our many questions about the universe, and solve many, if not all, of our human problems: disease, energy, pollution, poverty. At some stage in the future, science will be able to explain everything, and answer all our needs*” (9-10). Thus, at best God-believers are seen as backward simpletons; at worst they are a harmful plague upon mankind. This is seen in the debates over abortion, conversion therapy (for homosexuals and the “transgendered”), same-sex marriage and other moral issues.

But back to the origin of the moon. The Bible states unequivocally that on the fourth creation day God said, “Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and seasons, and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light on the earth; and it was so. Then God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also. God set them in the firmament of the heavens to give light on the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness” ([Gn 1:14-18](#)).

Contrast this straightforward account with the haw-humming speculations about the moon’s origin in the article from Earth.com staff writer Eric Ralls (I have italicized the statements of uncertainty in the article):

“It is widely believed that the moon formed during a collision between Earth and a small planet known as Theia about 4.5 billion years ago. But now, experts are proposing a new theory about the origin of the moon.”

“The research suggests that a young earth may have snatched the moon during a close encounter with a binary system.”

“Based on the Apollo data, planetary scientists ... *reached a consensus* that the moon formed from debris following a massive collision. *This explanation ... has shaped scientific understanding for decades.* However, two researchers from Penn State are challenging *this long-held narrative.* A study ... *suggests that* the moon was captured during a close encounter between earth and a pair of rocky bodies.”

“The Kona Conference *set the narrative* for 40 years ... but *certain unresolved questions remain ... It is believed* that Triton (Neptune’s largest moon, jj) was pulled into orbit from the Kuiper Belt, where *an estimated 10% of objects* are binary pairs. Triton’s retrograde orbit ... and its tilt of 67 degrees ... *suggest a capture event ... Williams and Zuger* calculated that Earth *could have captured* a satellite even larger than the moon ...”.

“(The moon’s) elliptical orbit would have contracted over thousands of years, gradually becoming more circular. Eventually, the lunar spin locked into the moon’s orbit around Earth, a state that persists today. At that point, the tidal evolution *likely reversed,* and the moon began slowly drifting away from Earth ... Williams and Zuger’s calculations *suggest* that a binary-exchange captured satellite *could exhibit* the same behaviors as Earth’s moon. But Williams acknowledged that *this theory is not necessarily the final word. ‘No one knows how the moon was formed.* For the last four decades, *we have had one possibility for how it got there.* Now, we have two. This opens a treasure trove of new questions and opportunities for further study.”

Frankly, this is not science; it is yarn-spinning. Words like “widely believed,” “suggests,” “reached a consensus,” “narrative,” “likely,” etc. are words of opinion and guesswork. They are not the words of scientific conclusions based on evidence. They are also words conspicuously absent in the Genesis account. There is a tinge of humor in all this. Williams flatly asserts, “No one knows how the moon was formed,” yet the explanation is on page 1 of the Bible. Oh, but that is not allowed because the Bible is not a scientific journal. Yet the great fathers of modern science were mostly believers in God who expected to find a universe of rational processes because of what they knew of its Creator. And they were right. But this pedigree has gradually faded from the collective memory of today’s scientists. **10/06/24 - The Centreville Journal**