

# Re: OT: Racial superiority / Intelligent design was Re: OT:Thanksgiving

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Cobol/comp.lang.cobol/2008-02/msg00497.html>

---

- *From:* "tlmfru" <lacey@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 11 Feb 2008 12:04:42 -0600
- 

Judson McClendon <judmc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:dOZrj.28992\\$1f.18693@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dOZrj.28992$1f.18693@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Please give some *\*reasonable\** hypothesis of how polonium particles could come into existence and *\*completely\** decay inside every granite rock on

the

planet, leaving 100% of the decay residue in place, *\*without\** evidence of any other decay that could produce the polonium. This is the situation as

it

is known to exist. It is perfectly consistent with instantaneous (or

nearly so)

creation of the Earth, with polonium particles embedded in the granite. I

is

not consistent with any reasonable theory on planetary creation that

leaves

God out. If that's not physical evidence of instantaneous creation, what would you consider to be evidence?

If you want to have your face rubbed in it, consult the articles by Thomas A. Baillieul (which I found on the net). His conclusions:

"Gentry's polonium halo hypothesis for a young Earth fails all tests. Gentry's entire thesis is built on a compounded set of

assumptions. He is unable to demonstrate that concentric haloes in mica are caused uniquely by alpha particles resulting from the decay of polonium isotopes. His samples are not from "primordial" pieces of the Earth's original crust, but from rocks which have been extensively reworked. Finally, his hypothesis cannot accommodate the many alternative lines of evidence that demonstrate a great age for the Earth. Gentry rationalizes any evidence which contradicts his hypothesis by proposing three "singularities" – one time divine interventions – over the past 6000 years. Of course, supernatural events and processes fall outside the realm of scientific investigations to address. As with the idea of variable radioactive decay rates, once Gentry moves beyond the realm of physical laws, his arguments fail to have any scientific usefulness. If divine action is necessary to fit the halo hypothesis into some consistent model of Earth history, why waste all that time trying to argue about the origins of the haloes based on current scientific theory? This is where most Creationist arguments break down when they try to adopt the language and trappings of science. Trying to prove a religious premise is itself an act of faith, not science."

(Gentry's hypothesis requires that all radioactive decay rates, EXCEPT for that of polonium, were substantially if not enormously faster in the 6,000–year period. This he attributes to acts of God. To attempt to prove what's supposedly a purely physical theory by calling on acts of God removes it from serious consideration as a physical theory).

Another, 10–page article by Richard Wakefield, blasts the Gentry theory thus:

- "1.The samples of biotite that contain Gentry's Po halos came from pegmatite dikes and calcite vein–dikes that cross–cut metamorphosed volcanic, sedimentary and igneous rock units – the dikes are clearly the last to form, not the first;
- 2.The dikes are not the vast extensive granite gneisses Gentry claims are the backbone of the mountains and continents — they are relatively small features;
- 3.The rocks at two of the sites are not even granites but calcite vein–dikes, most likely of hydrothermal origin. The biotite was formed in the solid matrix by metamorphism and
- 4.Crystal size in igneous, vein and metamorphic rocks ranges from microscopic to very large, is primarily due to cooling rates and crystal growth, and cannot be used to identify "created" rocks. "

(The author is a geologist in Canada and has worked at the sites that provided Gentry's samples).

Finally, try "POLONIUM HALOS AND MYRMEKITE IN PEGMATITE AND GRANITE" by Lorence G. Collins. Utterly trashes the theory.

Re: OT: Racial superiority / Intelligent design was Re: OT:Thanksgiving

Judson says that he finds all the refutations "preposterous". I will politely suggest that they make perfect sense for any one who's versed in geological science. I'm not, Judson's not, and Gentry isn't; he's a nuclear physicist. Reading these articles makes it very clear that geology is an immensely complicated field of knowledge which requires extensive study for a person to make such unusual statements as Gentry has done.

Give it up, Judson. "Gentryism" just won't fly.

PL

.