

Re: Origin of the Moon .. pro/con Collision Theory arguments invited

Re: Origin of the Moon .. pro/con Collision Theory arguments invited

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2008-05/msg00110.html>

- *From:* Stevepppp@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Tue, 20 May 2008 20:34:18 -0700 (PDT)
-

On May 20, 6:39 pm, Timberwoof <timberwoof.s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article
<27bc2272-5fc7-424b-bd0c-049f8beba...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

Stevep...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

Like Brad Guth, I don't favor the Collision Theory much either since the Collision Theory has at least a half dozen flaws. These are just off the top of my head. I didn't spend much time with them \

I could tell.

Troll alert alarm already flashing.

so if these
arguments can be picked apart, super.

Perhaps you could learn a bit from my picking...

Ok Slim Pickings. not holding my breath to find out.

Opposing Argument #1

Re: Origin of the Moon .. pro/con Collision Theory arguments invited

The collision had to happen early in the creation of BOTH earth and moon because both bodies had to be extremely molten everywhere, including at the surface. Why? Because later, the surfaces cooled and formed crusts so if it occurred recently, you'd see multiple places on both earth and moon where humongous chunks of crust exist. We're talking magnitudes the size of Mount Everest. You wouldn't get the perfectly smooth moon and earth we see today.

So it appears that the collision must have happened early in the evolution of both bodies .. ie "in the beginning". Such a collision is impossible according to big bang theory/the expanding universe theory since both bodies would be moving "outward" together at the same rate and direction so the two bodies would clump together, which is obviously ruled out, or keep moving outward and away from each other.