

The Scientifically Magic Origin of the Moon

Where did the Moon come from? Astronomy gives only two possibilities. Either it was created, or it came to exist by natural means long ago.

Among the majority of astronomers, today's standard belief of the Moon's origin relies on the popularised 'giant impact' theory. Supposedly, a Mars-sized object crashed into the Earth about 4.5 billion[Eng. milliard] years ago.

With this alleged collision being catastrophic, a significant part of the Earth would be exploded into space as debris, likely affecting Earth's generally circular orbit (Pluto's misshapen orbit and disparate plane providing a likely consequence of an impact result).

Then soon after the supposed collision, some of the debris fell back to Earth. The remaining debris left in space acquired sufficient gravity to coalesce into our Moon.*

The critical factor of this theory is that the Moon could not contain any water, not even deep inside. The collision necessary required a hit so powerful that practically no water could have remained in the debris -- it would be almost all vaporised. If any water remained, it could only be in trace amounts.

Although such giant impact model still has unsolved problems, the lack of water was one prediction that appeared successful. The Apollo astronauts collected a substantial weight of lunar soils and rocks, and brought them to Earth. The first analyses showed that the lunar samples were dry and so the theory was taken as vindicated.

However the samples were not dry.

Later, scientists re-examined some of the lunar samples using better equipment than was available during the Apollo era. By focussing on soils containing volcanic lava, such allowed the measuring of material from inside the Moon separately from the material on the surface.

From such re-examination it was discovered that these soils had about 10 times more water than expected. And with the current scientific theory depicting such quantity of water as impossible, a serious problem is immediately presented for such giant impact theory.

Unsurprisingly in the field of scholars, many astronomers remained adherent to the giant impact 'ruling paradigm' and outrightly denied the new find.

2.

Attempts were made to diminish its importance because it could not be harmonised with modern astronomy.

And again in 2011 an analysis was published which corroborated these findings of significant water. This time, researchers examined beads of the Moon's volcanic glass. Unlike the lava samples (which were likely to have lost some of their original water when they were formed in eruptions), the glass beads would have locked up and preserved some of the water which existed there when they were formed.

Therefore, this new analysis provides the most accurate measurements of how much water is still inside the Moon.

But these measurements revealed that the Moon doesn't just have about 10 times as much water as permitted from the giant impact theory, but some 100 times more.

Moon origin scholars are now faced with a critical problem. One of their theory's major predictions has been found to have no substance, yet this giant impact model is the only accepted scientific explanation for the Moon's origin (with other discoveries during the Apollo program acting to dismiss the 4 or 5 other origin theories)..†

And with the remaining giant impact theory also being contradicted by the 2011 lunar discovery, such reveals that the modern theories of the Solar System's formation allow no explanation of the Moon's existence.

But according to other researchers, the problem is yet worse than it appears.

It has been calculated that even if the giant impact model could somehow produce a Moon, the simple collision wouldn't be enough to do it -- because these researchers have been forced by the physics of the situation to believe that...

EARTH ONCE HAD TWO MOONS.

According to this idea -- which some scientists are forced to embrace -- the Earth used to have two similarly sized moons.

A question naturally arises: So why is there only one today?

3.

The answer given is: because the second one completely exploded in a collision with the Moon as seen today (although apparently no physical change occurred to the Moon's then orbit).

But why should senior scientists suggest a highly unprovable event?

Because there were discovered on the Moon's far side a number of mountains, some of which being much higher than the ones on the near side.

When forced to theorise that the high mountain discovery would need a separate external cause, the researchers developed a computer model. After a time of data manipulation, such model presented that if there were once two moons of just the right size, with just the right orbits, and which collided at just the right angle and velocity, then a high mountain range would have been pushed up on the Moon's far side.

Thus such theory became evidence for a new twin Moon model.

This modern scientific hypothesis is promoted to the public as the only likely possibility for one of the Moon's surprising features. That is, this latest scientific explanation of the Moon's origin depends on an enormity of odds, such being so high as to be classified by the laws of probability as scientifically impossible. Thus in the world of tangible physics, there is no explanation imaginable as to why the Moon exists, and no fact or facts known which would provide a basis for further scientific enquiry.

* The theory of coalescence, or a coming together of exploded bodies' parts and associated debris in space, is a theory contrary to what is everywhere observed, with exploded material never reversing by itself but moving outwards from the explosion's centre, never toward any central point. The theory of new cosmic bodies coalescing is only applicable if an independent force (as yet unknown and undetected) much greater than the gravity and momentum of the exploded pieces, eventually gathers it back into a coalescence of such dimension as would produce enough gravity to take over and solidify the cosmic body. Thus the concept of a "star nursery" or the like, no matter how beautifully illustrated and captioned, is a physical absurdity.

† One astrophysicist has summarised current scientific thinking concerning the Moon's origin: "The moon seems a highly unlikely object. Theoreticians have been led by frustration on more than one occasion to suggest facetiously that it does not exist." (Hartmann)

One such suggestion allowed for farce but no fiction when research revealed that Moon anomalies were so many and varied that another astrophysicist could present to a science-based audience such a scientific absurdity as: "The best possible explanation for the Moon is observational error – the Moon doesn't exist." (Shapiro)

Further statements from astrophysicists are: "we cannot help but come to the conclusion that the Moon by rights ought not to be there", and similarly: "scientifically speaking, the Moon should not exist. It doesn't obey the rules of astrophysics and no theory of its origin explains the known facts".