

Re: Science Disproves Evolution

Source: <http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Talk/talk.origins/2007-07/msg04159.html>

- *From:* Ritsjoena <bramvandam@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 09 Jul 2007 19:23:03 -0000
-

On Jul 9, 8:17 pm, Pahu <pah...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Missing Mass

Imagine seeing several rocks in outer space, moving radially away from Earth. If the rocks were simultaneously blasted away from Earth, their masses, changing velocities, and distances from Earth would have a very precise mathematical 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" (a). 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 assume the universe is filled with at least ten times as much matter as can be seen. This is maintained even though three decades of searching for this "missing mass" have turned up nothing other than the conclusion that it does not exist (b).

A second "fix attempt" assumes that the rocks (or, in the real problem, all particles in the universe) were briefly, almost magically, accelerated away from some point. This process, called inflation, supposedly reached speeds billions of trillions of times faster than the speed of light. An instant later, and for no apparent reason, inflation stopped. All this happened 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 the universe an age (based on one set of assumptions) of about 13.7 billion years. This is called the "inflationary big bang." It was proposed by Alan H. Guth in a paper titled "A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problem" in *Physical Review, D*, Vol. 23, 15 January 1981, pp. 348–356.

Such flights of imagination and speculation are common in the field of cosmology.

a. This problem was first explained by R. H. Dicke, "Gravitation and the Universe: The Jayne Lectures for 1969," *American Philosophical*

Re: Science Disproves Evolution

Society of Philadelphia, 1970, p. 62. Alan Guth's attempt to solve it (see "c" below) led to the "inflationary big bang theory."

b. This missing mass is called dark matter, because it cannot be seen and, so far, has not been detected. Candidates for "missing mass" include neutrinos, black holes, dead stars, low-mass stars, and various subatomic particles and objects dreamed up by cosmologists simply to solve this problem. Each candidate has many scientific problems.

One study of two adjacent galaxies shows they have relatively little dark matter. [See Ron Cowen, "Ringing In a New Estimate for Dark Matter," *Science News*, Vol. 136, 5 August 1989, p. 84.]

Another study found no missing mass within 150 million light-years of Earth. [See Eric J. Lerner, "COBE Confounds the Cosmologists," *Aerospace America*, March 1990, pp. 40-41.]

A third study found no dark matter in a large elliptical galaxy, M105. [See "Dark Matter Isn't Everywhere," *Astronomy*, September 1993, pp. 19-20.]

A fourth study found no dark matter in the main body of our galaxy. [See Alexander Hellemans, "Galactic Disk Contains No Dark Matter," *Science*, Vol. 278, 14 November 1997, p. 1230.]

A fifth study, after cataloging the positions and distances of 100 million galaxies, concluded that the needed mass does not exist. [See Ron Cowen, "Whole-Sky Catalog," *Science News*, Vol. 155, 6 February 1999, pp. 92-93.]

First of all this is the field of astronomy, not biology.

These are all theories currently under study. They are proposals with a better scientific foundation than you suggest. This is science. Science in progress.

Theories for the Evolution of the Solar System and Universe Are Unscientific and Hopelessly Inadequate

There is a lot of work still to be done. Whether it is science or not depends on the way scientists deal with these theories. That makes it science before the theories are adequately shown to be correct. (in science sense) So they are science in this case.

You have only mentioned astronomy subjects. Where does biology come in your story?

<http://www.creation-science.com/>

The theories mentioned above might be wrong. The theories behind this link are certainly wrong and certainly not scientific.