

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 18 Issue 7

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info

April 2014

SOMEHOW

Our April 2014 song parody is based on Beatle George Harrison's classic tune, "Something."

Most of our newsletters are serious reviews of the technical literature. But, in honor of National Theory of Evolution Day (April 1), we like to lighten things up with a little bit of foolishness.

Somehow ¹

Somehow in the ancient past
A cell was born that had no mother.
Somewhere in some slime so gooey.

I want to tell you now,
You know I believe and how.

Some way that nobody knows
She evolved to need a lover.
Something in her genes was sexy.

I want to tell you now,
You know I believe and how.

You're asking me why did she grow?
I don't know, I don't know.
Did she move fast, or was she slow?
I don't know, I don't know!

Somehow she evolved to know
What is going on around her.
Somehow her brown eyes can see me.

I want to tell you now,
You know I believe and how.

Fools believe anything a scientist tells them,
even if the scientist can't explain how it happened.

"Somehow" is never a scientific answer. Don't believe that life formed spontaneously, and evolved into all existing life forms, "somehow."

¹ Hear it performed by Death Valley Dave at <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/music/Somehow.mp3>

Email

OLD AGE FOOLISHNESS

Don't believe baseless assertions, even if they are said by scientists.

John began this exchange by sending us this email:

The challenge of age old assumptions made in the pursuit of science is the very heart of what science is about. However, as necessary as the questioning is for science to continue to move forward, an undesired consequence is the dumbing down of the population which results when basic knowledge is replaced by Dark Age mentality.

Those who believe the Earth to be 6000 years old without any evidence in support of such a ridiculous claim have failed to apply the principles they support in challenging science.

John
Sent from my iPad

So, we decided to bait him a little bit by sending this reply:

So, why don't you challenge the ridiculous claim that the Earth is billions of years old? Have you ever looked at the supposed evidence for the Old Earth hypothesis? More to the point, have you ever looked at the excellent evidence against it?
[\(<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/topics-age.htm>\)](http://scienceagainstevolution.info/topics-age.htm)

John's response was grammatically confusing. Here's exactly what he wrote:

And you thank **the moronic misuse of Genesis** from the Old Testament by nitwits who want [to] use their Incorrect [capitalization his] interpretation of the Bible as a replacement for true science for that dumbing down.

We have never thanked nitwits; nor have we ever quoted Genesis. So we replied,

When did I misuse (or even use) Genesis?

He replied,

I was not necessarily referring to you.

Not unless you advocate the teaching of a literal interpretation of the Bible as a basis for rejection of science, evolution, geology, etc.

Clearly, his criticism isn't based on anything we have written. That's why he doesn't know we have never advocated the teaching of a literal interpretation of the Bible. He thinks the only reason to believe the Earth is young is because of Genesis. So, we baited him some more.

Why don't you read what I have written, instead of accusing me of writing I have not written?

Why do you reject the scientific evidence for a young Earth? (Do you even know what that evidence is?)

He responded,

I read your piece criticizing one of the methods for determining the age of the Earth. That was what caused my comment to you. Although you were critical of one of the methods for determining the age of the earth the overwhelming weight of the evidence establishes that the Earth is some 4.5 billion years old. That proof comes from many different sources. Further, your criticism of one method of dating does not establish a younger age. It only cast some doubt on that method of dating. What proof do you offer to support your theory?

We don't know which piece he is referring to. There were links to more than 50 articles about the age of the Earth on the page we sent to him. We aren't critical of just one method. We are critical of all of the methods commonly used to argue for an old Earth.

He did not say there was anything factually wrong with our criticism of whichever dating method he read about. Apparently whatever we wrote, "cast some doubt on that method of dating," so there must have been some validity to our argument.

He asked, "What proof do you offer to support your theory?" We had already sent him a link to more than 50 articles we have written! What more does he want? If he really wanted to know what we think, he could have read what we have written.

Turn about is fair play. What does HE think is the overwhelming weight of the evidence that comes from many different sources? So, we asked him,

What is the "overwhelming evidence?"

We haven't heard from him since. That's because what little evidence there is, is underwhelming. If a strong case could be made for an Old Earth, somebody smarter than John would have made it. John has probably heard someone like Neil deGrasse Tyson say the Earth

is billions of years old on the *Cosmos* TV series, and John believes it. John has been dumbed down by a public school system that has replaced education with indoctrination. He is afraid to learn anything that might upset his comfortable beliefs. That's why he won't read what we have written about the age of the Earth. He would rather just send hate mail to people he thinks are religious nuts who don't know anything about science.

Ironically, the first sentence John wrote to us is the most important. "The challenge of age-old assumptions made in the pursuit of science is the very heart of what science is about." He refuses to challenge assumptions. That's foolish.

Evolution on TV

LUNACY: A SPACETIME "ODDITY"

President Obama was right when he said, "You can't believe everything you see on Fox."

People like John, who wrote the emails to us printed in this month's newsletter, believe all the nonsense stated as fact on TV science shows. This month there is a "science" series running on the Fox network and National Geographic channel titled, *Cosmos: A Spacetime Odyssey*. It presents all sorts of speculation as scientific fact. For example, Neil deGrasse Tyson tells how the Moon formed, with a perfectly straight face.

The Earth took one hell of a beating the first billion years. Fragments of orbiting debris collided and coalesced until they snowballed to form our moon. The Moon is a souvenir of that violent epoch. If you stood on the surface of that long-ago Earth, the Moon would have looked 100 times brighter. It was 10 times closer back then—locked in a much more intimate gravitational embrace. As the Earth cools, seas began to form. The tides were 1,000 times higher then. Over the eons, tidal friction from the Earth pushed the Moon away.²

If one didn't read the professional scientific literature, one would think that scientists know how the Moon formed, and that it happened just the way Tyson said it did. The fact is, the formation of the Moon is an unsolved mystery. We know that because we really do read the professional, peer-reviewed, scientific literature. Here's a sampling of what that literature says.

² *Cosmos: A Spacetime Odyssey*, "Episode 1: Standing Up in the Milky Way", March 9, 2014 (45 minutes into the program)

Lunar-origin studies are in flux. No current impact model stands out as more compelling than the rest. Progress in several areas is needed to rule out some theories, support others or direct us to new ones.³

It remains troubling that all of the current impact models invoke a process after the impact to effectively erase a primary outcome of the event — either by changing the disk's composition through mixing for the canonical impact, or by changing Earth's spin rate for the high-angular-momentum narratives.⁴

Our knowledge of how Earth's natural satellite [that is, the Moon] formed is increasingly being challenged by observations and computer simulations.⁵

Here's a short summary of the problem:

Since the 1980s, work on lunar origins has focused on the 'giant-impact' theory. This proposes that the collision of another planet-sized body with the forming Earth generated a disk of debris that coalesced into the Moon. Such giant collisions were common in the Solar System during the final stages of Earth's formation 4.5 billion years ago.

But we still do not understand in detail how an impact could have produced our Earth and Moon. In the past few years, computer simulations, isotope analyses of rocks and data from lunar missions have raised the possibility of new mechanisms to explain the observed characteristics of the Earth–Moon system.

The main challenge is to simultaneously account for the pair's dynamics — in particular, the total angular momentum contained in the Moon's orbit and Earth's 24-hour day — while also reconciling their many compositional similarities and few key differences. The collision of a large impactor with Earth can supply the needed angular momentum, but it also creates a disk of material derived largely from the impactor. If the infalling body had a different composition from Earth, as seems probable given that most objects in the inner Solar System do, then why is the composition of the Moon so similar to the outer portions of

our planet?⁶

The giant-impact hypothesis of lunar origin is celebrated for its simplicity: a late, grazing impact on the proto-Earth launches a portion of the rocky mantle into orbit and establishes the angular momentum of the Earth–Moon system. The Moon, depleted of iron and volatile elements relative to Earth, forms from this hot circumterrestrial disk of rocky mantle. Hydrodynamic simulations of giant impacts successfully produce disks of low iron content and sufficient mass to make this hypothesis plausible. The fatal issue is that simulations that lead to the present angular momentum derive most disk material from the impactor. Thus, the giant-impact model predicts that Earth and the Moon should be derived from different source material, each with distinct isotopic fingerprints, and this contradicts the geochemical (isotopic) observations.⁷

As emphasized in a Royal Society meeting in September that debated the origin of the Moon, the compositional differences between Earth and the Moon that would be expected as a consequence are increasingly at odds with diverse, high-precision isotopic observations.⁸

Thus, differences in oxygen, tungsten and silicon isotope ratios between target and impactor seem inevitable, and so the standard model predicts isotopic differences between Earth and the Moon that are not observed.⁹

So far, the solutions proposed appeal to extra processes — such as extensive mixing of materials from both bodies or a later gravitational resonance with the Sun — the feasibility of which are unclear.¹⁰

All scientists really know about how the Moon formed is that it happened, “somehow.” That's not a scientific answer. But programs like *Cosmos* make it appear that scientists know how the Moon formed (and that life evolved)—and people like John believe it.

³ Canup, *Nature*, 5 December 2013, “Lunar conspiracies”, pages 27-29, <http://www.nature.com/news/planetary-science-lunar-conspiracies-1.14270>

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ Elliott & Stewart, *Nature*, 5 December 2013, “Shadows cast on Moon's origin”, pages 90-91, <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v504/n7478/full/504090a.html>

⁶ Canup, *Nature*, 5 December 2013, “Lunar conspiracies”, pages 27-29, <http://www.nature.com/news/planetary-science-lunar-conspiracies-1.14270>

⁷ Elliott & Stewart, *Nature*, 5 December 2013, “Shadows cast on Moon's origin”, pages 90-91, <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v504/n7478/full/504090a.html>

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ Canup, *Nature*, 5 December 2013, “Lunar conspiracies”, pages 27-29, <http://www.nature.com/news/planetary-science-lunar-conspiracies-1.14270>

APRIL FOOLS – AND MISSING LINKS

<https://www.apologeticspress.org/apcontent.aspx?category=9&article=1816>

Tiktaalik roseae

This month's web site review looks at an article that fits the spirit of April as being the month of April Fools. The article deals with missing links and how important they are for evolutionists.

The article is published by the Apologetics Press. This organization tries to "make available scripturally sound and scientifically accurate materials in apologetics." You can read what they believe by following the link "About AP" on the main web page.

The missing link under discussion on this site is *Tiktaalik roseae*. Evolutionists and the popular press have announced this discovered fossil to be the missing link between fish and land-dwelling creatures. The article describes the scientific report that was published announcing the discovery. In the report, the authors announce the "discovery of a well-preserved species of fossil sarcopterygian fish from the Late Devonian of Artic Canada that represents an intermediate between fish with fins and tetrapods with limbs, and provides unique insights into how and in what order important tetrapod characters arose."

The article points out that much of the report was speculation and propaganda which "might be acceptable or even expected from the popular press, but not from a scientific journal where researchers should not delve into the realm of imagination or guesswork." Nevertheless, the authors of the scientific study "wanted everyone to know that 'the missing link' was no longer missing." The report created a media frenzy about this new creature. Headlines declared: "IT WAS one of the most important events of the last 400 million years: the moment our fishy ancestors began hauling themselves onto dry land." The New York Times account "confronted the controversy between creation and evolution, noting: 'Other scientists said that in addition to confirming elements of a major transition in evolution, the fossils were a powerful rebuttal to religious creationists, who have long argued that the absence of such transitional creatures are a serious weakness in Darwin's theory.'"

The article continues to discuss what they really found. As you can imagine, fossilized remains can "only tell us so much about a creature." Most of what was reported was just subjective speculation.

Near the end of the article, previous "missing links" such as the coelacanth are mentioned. This fish was discovered in the western Indian Ocean in 1938.

The article concludes with references that provide material for further study.



**You are permitted (even encouraged)
to copy and distribute this newsletter.**

Disclosure, the Science Against Evolution newsletter, is edited by R. David Pogge.

All back issues are on-line at **ScienceAgainstEvolution.info**.