

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 12 Issue 9

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

June 2008

THE AGE OF THE MOON

Evolutionists say that the Moon is $4.43 \pm 0.13 \times 10^9$ years old. Is that correct?

Last month we saw that rubidium-strontium isochron dating of the Apollo 11 moon rocks showed that the moon is 4.3 to 4.56 billion years old. That method depends upon an unwarranted assumption about the initial concentrations of rubidium and strontium isotopes. This month we want to compare that age with ages other qualified scientists found using other techniques.

THE CHASE

Since this article gets so technical that we might lose some readers along the way, let's just cut to the chase while everyone is still with us.

Scientists computed the age of the Apollo 11 moon rocks 116 times using methods other than rubidium-strontium isochron dating. Of those 116 dates, only 10 of them fall in the range of 4.3 to 4.56 billion years, and 106 don't. The non-isochron dates range from 40 million years to 8.2 billion years.

When faced with this obvious discrepancy, evolutionists sometimes backpedal by saying that although the radiometric dates may not be perfectly accurate, even 40 million years is much older than 6,000 years, so the radiometric ages still prove the Earth is old. That reasoning fails because the ages aren't simply inaccurate—they

are invalid. All of the ages were calculated using baseless assumptions about the initial concentrations of radioactive isotopes and erroneous speculation about how those concentrations changed over time. The calculated ages have nothing to do with how old the rocks are, and have everything to do with how much of each kind of isotope was in the rocks when they were formed.

THE DETAILS

Even before the Apollo 11 astronauts brought rocks back from the moon, scientists from all over the world were clamoring to get the chance to analyze them. Therefore, NASA gave many scientists the opportunity to write proposals telling how they would analyze the moon rocks if they were given the opportunity. Based on the merit of the proposals and the qualifications of the scientists, they allowed a few select scientists access to the samples. Their findings were presented at the Apollo 11 Lunar Science Conference, and the complete proceedings (335 pages) were published in the January 30, 1970, issue of *Science*. Nine of the papers presented at the conference deal with the age of the moon. For convenience, we have numbered those nine papers in Table 1. We will refer to those sources

Table 1. References from *Science*, 30 January, 1970

- "The Moon Issue" dedicated to the proceedings of the Apollo 11 Lunar Science Conference
1. Mitsunobu Tatsumoto, *et al.*, "Age of the Moon: An Isotopic Study of Uranium-Thorium-Lead Systematics of Lunar Samples" pages 461-463.
 2. A. L. Albee, *et al.*, "Ages, Irradiation History, and Chemical Composition of Lunar Rocks from the Sea of Tranquility" pages 463-466.
 3. Grenville Turner, "Argon-40/Argon-39 Dating of Lunar Rock Samples" pages 466-468.
 4. Leon T. Silver, "Uranium-Thorium-Lead Isotope Relations in Lunar Materials" pages 468-471.
 5. K. Gopalan, *et al.*, "Rubidium-Strontium, Uranium, and Thorium-Lead Dating of Lunar Material" pages 471-473.
 6. P. M. Hurley, *et al.*, "Rubidium-Strontium Relations in Tranquility Base Samples" pages 473-474.
 7. William Compston, *et al.*, "Rubidium-Strontium Chronology and Chemistry of Lunar Material" pages 474-476.
 8. V. Rama Murthy, *et al.*, "Rubidium-Strontium Age and Elemental and Isotopic Abundances of Some Trace Elements in Lunar Samples" pages 476-479.
 9. R. K. Wanless, *et al.*, "Age Determinations and Isotopic Abundance Measurements on Lunar Samples" pages 479-480.

by number in Table 2.

Table 2 shows the minimum and maximum calculated ages for every moon rock.

Table 2. Minimum and Maximum Moon Rock Ages			
Sample	Age (x 10 ⁹)	Method	Source
10003	<1.0	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar low temp	3
10003	4.025	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	1
10017	< 0.25	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar low temp	3
10017	4.67	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	4
10020	3.765	²⁰⁶ Pb/ ²³⁸ U	1
10020	3.996	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	1
10022	< 0.75	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar low temp	3
10022	3.59 ± 0.06	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar high temp	3
10024	< 0.2	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar low temp	3
10024	4.050 ± 0.7	⁸⁷ Sr/ ⁸⁷ Rb isochron	5
10044	< 0.8	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar low temp	3
10044	3.74 ± 0.05	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar high temp	3
10045	4.17	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	4
10045	4.17	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	4
10047	4.21	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	4
10047	4.95	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	4
10050	3.680	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	1
10050	4.051	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	1
10057	2.27	⁴⁰ K- ⁴⁰ Ar unspiked	9
10057	4.173	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	1
10060	3.365	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	4
10060	5.76	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	4
10061	4.594	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	1
10061	4.710	²⁰⁶ Pb/ ²³⁸ U	1
10062	< 1.0	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar low temp	3
10062	3.83 ± 0.06	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar high temp	3
10069	0.04	Cosmic ray exposure	2
10069	4.9 ± 0.4	⁴⁰ K- ⁴⁰ Ar feldspar glass	2
10071	3.374	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	1
10071	3.826	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	1
10072	< 0.6	⁴⁰ Ar/ ³⁹ Ar low temp	3
10072	4.13	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb	4
10084	4.31	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	4
10084	8.2	²⁰⁸ Pb/ ²³² Th	9
10085	4.44	⁸⁷ Sr/ ⁸⁷ Sr	2

As you can see, the age of the same rock measured by different scientists using different techniques varied widely.

We don't have space in the printed version of the newsletter to list all the published age measurements, but we have put the entire table on our web page.¹ Which age is correct? None of them!

Sample 10017 was dated by five different sources with nineteen different results. Here is how one of those sources tried to spin the results.

The ⁴⁰K-⁴⁰Ar ages are for No. 17: whole rock, 2.45 x 10⁹ years; the ⁴He age, 2.5 x 10⁹ years [U-Th from (2)]; plagioclase, 3.2 x 10⁹ years. For No. 44: whole rock, 3.45 x 10⁹ years; pyroxene, 3.6 x 10⁹ years. For No. 69: whole rock, 2.9 x 10⁹ years. For soil: feldspar glass, 4.9 ± 0.4 x 10⁹ years; brown glass, 1.6 x 10⁹ years.

Comparison of mineral and rock data demonstrates gas loss. The plagioclase for No. 17 yields a much higher age than the total rock, indicating Ar loss from the fine-grained, K-rich, interstitial phases. The concordance of He and Ar ages must be fortuitous. The maximum age is equal to the Rb-Sr age, and the general pattern is compatible with the Sr results. Assuming no inheritance of Ar, the age of the brown glass fragment shows that the soil contains particles produced by events of intermediate age (~ 10⁹ years).²

They think that the agreement between the argon age and the helium age is "fortuitous" (dumb luck) because both are too young and can't possibly be right. They blame the error on "gas loss." This is funny because potassium-argon dating on Earth rocks often gives dates that are too old. The "excess argon" problem has been known since 1969.³ We have talked about it in detail in a previous newsletter.⁴ But, perhaps in 1970, it wasn't well known to the scientists studying the moon rocks. Here's what they said.

Abstract. Seven crystalline rock samples returned by Apollo 11 have been analyzed in detail by means of the ⁴⁰Ar-³⁹Ar dating technique. The extent of radiogenic argon loss in these samples ranges from 7 percent to > 48 percent. Potassium-argon ages, corrected for the effects of this loss, cluster relatively closely around the value of 3.7 x 10⁹ years. Most of the vulcanism associated with the formation of the

¹ ScienceAgainstEvolution.org/ages.htm

² A. L. Albee, et al., *Science*, 30 January 1970, "Ages, Irradiation History, and Chemical Composition of Lunar Rocks from the Sea of Tranquility" pages 463-466.

³ *Disclosure*, February 1997, "Exact Dating (More or Less)"

⁴ *Disclosure*, September 2001, "Danny Defends Argon Dating"

Mare Tranquillitatis presumably occurred around 3.7×10^9 years ago. A major cause of the escape of gas from lunar rock is probably the impact event which ejected the rock from its place of origin to its place of discovery. Upper limits for the times at which these impact events occurred have been estimated.⁵

Let's not let that slip by unnoticed. The uncorrected potassium-argon dates were so young that they assumed almost half (48%) of the argon was lost in a speculative "impact event." But even when they assume that the amount of argon in the rock was almost double what they actually measured, they only come up with 3.7 billion years, which still isn't old enough.

Don't let us put words in their mouths. Here is what they actually said.

The assumptions are made that the rock was free of argon when formed and that it has quantitatively retained ^{40}Ar , from the decay of ^{40}K , since that time. The assumption of quantitative argon retention is particularly inappropriate for the lunar rocks. The rocks returned to earth have been picked up loose from the surface of the moon, presumably at some distance from their place of origin. The presence of shock effects in some, if not all, of the crystalline rocks indicates that high-energy events, possibly meteorite impacts, may have transported the rocks from their place of origin to their place of discovery and it is very probable that argon loss occurred at the time of transfer. In an attempt to estimate the extent of gas loss and to apply a suitable correction to the potassium-argon age, an activation technique, the ^{40}Ar - ^{39}Ar method, has been applied to seven of the crystalline lunar rocks.⁶

If they hadn't "known" the "true" age of the rocks is 4.4 billion years, would they have made these "corrections?" Of course not! They are just twisting the facts to fit their prejudice. But it gets better. Here's the abstract by a different team of scientists.

Abstract. A K-Ar age of 2300×10^6 years has been determined for a sample of type A crystalline rock (57,34). The presence of an anomalously large quantity of ^{40}Ar , in a sample of type C breccia (65,35) precluded the calculation of its K-Ar age.⁷

⁵ Grenville Turner, *Science*, 30 January 1970, "Argon-40/ Argon-39 Dating of Lunar Rock Samples" pages 466-468.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ R. K. Wanless, *et al.*, *Science*, 30 January 1970, "Age Determinations and Isotopic Abundance Measurements on Lunar Samples" pages 479-480.

There was so much "excess argon" in one of the moon rocks they could not even calculate the age! But the rocks they could calculate ages for had lost so much argon that they yielded an age that was slightly more than half of what it "should" have been.

WHY DON'T SCIENTISTS KNOW THIS?

We've just scratched the surface of all the contradictory findings and fantastic rationalization regarding the ages of the moon rocks. All these discrepant moon rock ages were published in a respectable scientific journal (not a crackpot creationist magazine) nearly 40 years ago. Any dues-paying member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) can read this landmark issue of *Science*, so "real scientists" have no excuse for not knowing it.

Why isn't the unreliability of radiometric dating better known by scientists? Why don't more scientists know about the scientific failings of the theory of evolution? We thought you would never ask. Fortunately, Tim did. So we gave him an answer in this month's email column.

Email

IS IT JUST US?

The evolution/creation debate doesn't seem to be world-wide. Why is that?

Don sent us copies of two long emails sent to him by his nephew, Tim. Here are the two most pertinent paragraphs.

Why is it that most of the people who have a problem with the theory of evolution seem to be Christians? The image I get is that the vast majority of people who should be well-informed on evolution don't disagree with it, but there is a subset of people who know about evolution who disagree with it, and the majority of them are Christian.

In Japan, for example, from what I can see there is no "evolution versus creation" debate. Evolution is accepted, and, perhaps not coincidentally, Japan is a very non-Christian nation. If, objectively speaking, the theory of evolution has the kinds of flaws in it that some people believe it does, why are scientists all over the world not arguing about it? Why doesn't the entire world question it? From what I can see, it's mainly Christians who do, and that of course leads to the suspicion that they are biased.

Tim's premise is that the theory of evolution is rejected by a larger percentage of the population in Christian nations than non-Christian nations. So, there are two issues we need to address. First, is the premise true? Second, if it is true, why is it true?

Tim's observation that people living in non-

Christian nations accept evolution more often than people living in Christian nations is mostly correct. In a previous newsletter ⁸ we discussed a survey of the attitudes of 34 nations toward the theory of evolution. That survey showed that roughly 50% of the people in Turkey, and 40% of the people in the United States firmly reject the theory of evolution. Turkey is not a Christian nation—it's an Islamic nation (as Tim acknowledges in another part of his very long email). But Moslems share the same belief about creation as Jews and Christians do, so let's not quibble about that.

That same survey showed that only about 10% of the people in Iceland and Japan reject evolution. Tim (who apparently has just moved to Japan) has correctly observed that most of the people in Japan are not Christians. Iceland is officially a Lutheran nation, with 86% of the citizens calling themselves Lutherans ⁹; but I know from my visit there that church attendance is extremely low. Icelanders are justifiably proud of their long tradition of religious tolerance; but there is a fine line between tolerance and indifference. They clearly have stepped over that line. Most Icelanders are Lutherans in name only. It isn't a strongly Christian nation, despite the 86% church membership.

So, Tim's premise is correct. There is a correlation between religious beliefs and attitudes toward evolution. So, the question is, "Why?"

Unfortunately, we haven't made much progress on our research project into Icelandic attitudes toward evolution. ¹⁰ We need some support from someone in Iceland, but we are running into a wall of indifference. Our few contacts there don't care enough about the issue to help us. If there is anyone looking for an idea for a Ph.D. thesis, and would like to try to determine why evolution is so widely accepted in Iceland, please contact us and maybe we can work something out together.

Since we are unaware of any study that definitively answers Tim's question, we will offer an opinion. It is my personal opinion that culture and religion are both involved. Let's talk about culture first.

THE CULTURAL REASON

Americans like to think for themselves. They are naturally skeptical, and don't respond well to being told what to believe. Therefore they are willing, even eager, to argue with someone who makes outrageous claims about reptiles growing breasts without any evidence to back it up.

Japan has traditionally had a much more polite culture than America has. Teachers and parents are treated with greater respect and deference in Japan than in America. Japan certainly has talented scientists who have made great strides in technical fields (computers, audio equipment, etc.) because they can do that without disrespecting their elders. They don't have to tell their elders that what they used to believe about the right way to build a computer or build a CD player is wrong because their elders never made computers or CD players. But a Japanese student is (historically) unlikely to tell a biology teacher that he is wrong about anything. A good Japanese son does not disagree with his father or teacher. Granted, American culture may be corrupting Japanese young people and undermining the respect that they have for their elders; but I think it is still more difficult for Japanese people to buck the established order than it is for Americans. That, I think, is the cultural part of the reason why evolution is not questioned more in Japan.

Icelandic culture is very tolerant about personal beliefs. They don't care if you go to church on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, or not at all. They don't care if you believe in trolls or Norse gods. Your belief is your belief, and it isn't worth arguing about it. They care about science in practical matters, such as harnessing geothermal energy and smelting aluminum; but they don't care much about the philosophical aspects of science. It is more important (to them) to figure out how to heat your house for free with geothermal energy than it is to figure out if man evolved from apes or not.

THE RELIGIOUS REASON

Since this is a personal opinion not based on any solid scientific data, let me give you some personal context. I don't spend ALL my time reading scientific literature that relates to the theory of evolution. But, since I love science, I sometimes watch science programs even if they have nothing to do with evolution. In particular, I recently watched 36 half-hour lectures on the history of science up to 1700. ¹¹ Since Darwin's Origin of Species wasn't published until 1859, I didn't expect the lectures to have any relevance to evolution. I was expecting the professor to present a progression of discovery to discovery with wrong ideas replacing correct ones. There was surprisingly little of that.

Instead, Dr. Principe talked at great length about how science was related to the worldview of

⁸ Disclosure, March 2007, "Evolution in Iceland"

⁹ 2007 World Almanac, page 781

¹⁰ Disclosure, March 2007, "Evolution in Iceland"

¹¹ Dr. Lawrence M. Principe, John Hopkins University, "History of Science: Antiquity to 1700", The Teaching Company, www.teach12.com

the people at that time. He used the term “natural philosophy” interchangeably with “science,” and actually said “natural philosophy” much more often than he said “science.” He talked about the classical period, when Greeks such as Aristotle and Plato expressed their religious beliefs and philosophical speculation in scientific terms. It didn’t stop there. Science and religion were deeply intertwined through the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Scientific Revolution. Many of the scientific leaders throughout history were actually theologians.

There was a period of history when the most respected scientists were Arabs. “Algebra” and “alchemy” are anglicized Arabic words because the earliest papers about them were written in Arabic. Some European scientists even wrote their scientific papers as if they were translations from Arabic just to give them credibility. It should not come as a surprise that there is strong scientific resistance to the theory of evolution in Turkey.

Moslems have a rich heritage of scientific excellence that isn’t mentioned much in American public schools. Perhaps there is a historical reason for this. In the 19th century, when American public schools still reflected Christian thinking, the Christian understanding of the book of Daniel was that the good “King of the North” represented Christianity, and the bad “King of the South” represented Islam. Americans believed that there would be a great conflict between Christianity and Islam just before the coming of Christ. The fall of the Ottoman Empire was seen to have prophetic significance. So, American public schools in the 19th and 20th centuries didn’t have much good to say about Moslems. Therefore, the Arab contributions to science were overlooked, and still have not been restored to the American public school science curriculum. I spent much of my engineering career figuring out ways to defeat foreign technology on the battlefield. Because of that, I now have a greater appreciation for the technical skill of other cultures than I had when I graduated.

The notion that science has historically been nothing more than natural philosophy came as something of a shock to me because I was raised in the 1950’s and 1960’s, when science meant “things discovered using the scientific method.” When I was growing up, if you could not prove it experimentally, it wasn’t scientific. In recent years I have objected to modern scientists trying to change the definition of science to “whatever most scientists think.” But I now see that, historically, science has never been anything other than the opinion of philosophers and scientists.

When I was growing up, experimental proof

was necessary. Apparently, that was just a short aberration in science in the 1950’s and 1960’s. It got us to the moon, but now proof isn’t really necessary. All that counts now is consensus.

Now there really is no difference between religion and science (that is, natural philosophy), and historically there never has been. Since the theory of evolution is a natural philosophy that is incompatible with Christianity and Islam, it should come as no surprise that there is controversy. Parents don’t want their tax money spent on public schools that teach a natural philosophy that is contradictory to their own religion to their own children. They really don’t want it taught as undeniable fact when the experimental and observational evidence is so strongly against evolution.

THE CHRISTIAN BIAS

Tim is suspicious that Christianity biases people against evolution. That is true; but does that make evolution right? Christianity biases people against murder. Does that make murder right?

We should cut out all the cultural and religious bias and distractions, and take an objective view. The theory of evolution says all living things evolved from a common ancestor. All that really matters is if that theory is true or not. Creationists can calmly point to many experimental and observational evidences that the theory is not true. Evolutionists will no longer participate in public debates with creationists because they always lose a factual discussion. So, evolutionists get emotional and go to court to prevent both sides of the issue to be presented in public schools. Evolutionists pressure institutions to fire scientists who don’t agree with the theory of evolution.

Tim is right. There is a religious aspect of the creation/evolution controversy. We don’t fault him for suspecting bias on the part of Christians. He should also, however, suspect bias on the part of non-Christians. Then he should look at the facts. He should ponder our Seventy-five theses.¹² He should ask evolutionists why they believe evolution is true. He should demand something more than, “Everyone knows it is true,” and unsubstantiated statements like, “mammals evolved from reptiles.” When he does that, we hope he will come to the correct conclusion all by himself.

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

¹² Disclosure, March 2008, “Seventy-five Theses”

by Lothar Janetzko

THEORY OF EVOLUTION

http://www.conservapedia.com/Theory_of_evolution

Conservapedia: The Trustworthy Encyclopedia

This month's web site review looks at an article in Conservapedia about the theory of evolution. You may not have heard anything about this particular encyclopedia, but it is very similar in structure to Wikipedia – the free encyclopedia. The main page of Conservapedia states that "it has had over 63,500,000 page views and over 457,000 page edits. The truth shall set you free."

Typical of articles in both Wikipedia and Conservapedia, an article begins with a brief description of the topic under discussion and then is followed by a Contents pane that can be hidden if desired. For this article on the Theory of evolution the Contents are organized as follows: 1) Theory of Evolution – Mutations and the Life Sciences in General, 2) Theory of Evolution and Little Consensus, 3) Genetic Code, Processing of Biological Data, and Biological Information, 4) Theory of Evolution and Cases of Fraud, Hoaxes and Speculation, 5) Theory of Evolution and Lack of Any Clear Transitional Forms, 6) The Fossil Record and the Evolutionary Position, 7) Paleoanthropology, 8) Theory of Punctuated Equilibrium 9) The Issue of Whether the Evolutionary Position Qualifies as a Scientific Theory, 10) Implausible Explanations and the Evolutionary Position, 11) Statements of Design, 12) Theory of Evolution and the Scientific Journals, 13) Effect on Scientific Endeavors Outside the Specific Field of Biology, 14) Age of the Earth and Universe and the Theory of Evolution, 15) Scientific Community Consensus and the Macroevolution Position, 16) Social Effects of the Theory of Evolution, 17) Creation Scientists Tend to Win Creation-Evolution Debates, 18) Theory of Evolution and Liberalism, 19) Online Videos on the Theory of Evolution, 20) Further Reading (including free on-line versions), 21) See also, 22) External Links and 23) References.

On the talk page tab you learn that "after much debate, the Conservapedia Panel has finished reviewing the Theory of Evolution page. We have determined that the article will remain protected indefinitely, to protect it from inevitable vandalism." Improvements to the article should be submitted to the panel.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of



**P.O. Box 923
Ridgecrest, CA 93556**

R. David Pogge, President, Editor
Andrew S. Ritchie, Vice President
Susan S. Pogge, Secretary/Treasurer
www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org