



# CSA News

The Creation Science Association for Mid-America

*"It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in men" Psalm 118:8*

*Volume 17 (1) Jan/Feb, 2000*

## More Great Proofs of Evolution

### **"The Laws of Cause and Effect, and the 1st and 2nd Laws of Thermodynamics have been invalidated by modern science"**

by Tom Willis

A fellow toiler in the vineyard of creation apologetics recently wrote for my advice in dealing with a verbal and written challenge he had received. He asked that the matter be kept confidential so I will use pseudonyms, "T" for toiler and "C" for challenger. You may ask, "Why do I not just keep it fully confidential?" Glad you asked. At first I was tempted to be a bit flattered by the request. He reminded me he had made similar requests and said "You have always been extremely gracious in providing the help I needed." But, he is a Ph.D., he doesn't ask trivial questions. I am writing about it because it required a lot of thought; it involves claims that are being widely made today; I have spent time for many years reflecting on these same questions, logging things I found; there are others, like "T;" who "**never** want to teach error" (a very commendable position); and finally, I try to redeem the limited time God has given me by making these efforts available to others. Rather than summarize the *challenges*, I'll simply include them as subheads:

#### **Are the laws of "Classical Physics" true?**

My friend was accused of using "antiquated science" (see the title) to prove creation, while ignoring modern physics and "current evolutionary ideas." For some reason my high school physics teacher decided I had promise. Unknown to me, he applied for and received (for me) a physics scholarship which I held for four years. I enjoyed the early years, through thermodynamics, even to this day remembering my professors fondly. But for reasons I could not explain for 30 years, I was uncomfortable with light, electricity, electronics and atomic physics. I got my degree in physics, but had no interest in continuing. My Masters is in a different field. I was a total pagan during this time, but I now feel the Lord knew what He was up to in my life. We'll get to that later.

I'll try to give you my understanding of what is going on. "**Classical Physics**" is a very broad term including some very testable claims, but also including some fundamental errors and some theories that **cannot** even be tested. "Laws, theories, models, hypotheses, etc" are all man's attempts to make general statements about the universe from specific observations. This is called empirical science and the reasoning process is called inductive reasoning. Though some have been more ardent supporters than others, all who have studied these *methods* have noted their potential weaknesses. You can never "prove" that every action force has an equal and opposite reaction force (3rd Law of Motion), or that matter and life never self-generate (1st Law of Thermodynamics & Law of Biogenesis). You will never observe all events involving matter, all life forms or events, or all types of action

forces, much less all events of all types. The "scientific method" is supposed to be a process where hypotheses, theories, etc. (today these are sometimes lumped and called "explanations") are rigorously and repeatedly tested with an effort to prove them false. Failure to do so tends to increase confidence they are true. It is vital to remember, **at it's very best, the Scientific Method leads only to a reasonable faith!** In practice, many problems arise. "Laws of Science" are chosen more like politicians are elected than by any formal "scientific method." No judge or committee says, "We certify this theory to be science." Newton's mechanics were widely accepted because they were easily tested and found applicable in many useful areas. Some parts of "Gravity" are easily tested (rocks go down and a measurable force is involved), but "gravity" also includes all masses and all distances, both untestable claims. Some people believe "gravity" was accepted because its basic proposition is easily tested (rocks go down), but much of "gravity" was accepted, some with no tests ever being applied, because it helped *prove* that Earth moves around the sun, when the Bible clearly suggests the opposite.

With light, electricity and magnetism the history is even more interesting. Maxwell developed some of the most useful (in an engineering sense) equations in history. For his purposes the electron was represented as a **mathematical point**, irrational, but workable assumptions for the technology of his time. Thus, Maxwell's equations treat the electron as a non-physical particle having no mass, dimensions or elasticity... fundamental assumptions which were not testable until this century, when they were **all shown to be false**. Errors of this sort were not unique to Maxwell. We are merely using his for this illustration.

Note, do not "turn off" if I am mistaken in some of the details, or you are disinterested in them, the message is relevant. As near as I can tell Maxwell's assumptions were never corrected, possibly because *science* does not progress in an orderly fashion. Other theories became popular before the error could be proved. A whole series of experiments were devised in the study of light. I'll mention only the most famous. In 1810 Arago looked at the effect of a moving plate of glass on a light beam. Using earth-bound light, the moving plate behaved according to theory, but starlight, which should have been affected by the enormous velocity of the earth, was not. It appeared that the earth was at rest, a serious scientific heresy. Fresnell got similar results and explained it away plausibly by claiming the earth was dragging space with it. Note: space was then called (or filled with) "Aether," but is said today to be filled with fields and virtual particles.

Stokes explained the Arago problem by claiming space was compressed by the movement of the glass. In 1897, Michelson published evidence refuting Stokes. Larmor proposed a Stokes variant which assumed transmission by the glass was constant regardless of motion. Some feel that Fresnell drag could **not** account for all of the discrepancy. Some people argue that the medium slows *c* (the supposed velocity of light in a vacuum). Others claim that is an erroneous interpretation, that light

velocity is the same in glass as in a vacuum... light's true speed is infinite.

The Foucault pendulum, oblateness of the earth, Doppler effect Coriolis and centrifugal forces and other *proofs* of earth motion, all measure only relative motion, their effects can be explained by star motion or other theories. But some of the optical experiments were designed to measure absolute earth motion. The wicket began to get stickier.

In 1871 the Astronomer Royal of England, George Airy did a variation of Arago which again was designed in such a manner it could measure absolute earth motion. Looking at stars, if the earth is moving, or if the light source (the star) is moving and the earth stationary, the relative motion of the telescope and the light traveling down the telescope would be sideways relative to the telescope and Airy would have to tilt the telescope to keep the light from hitting the side. This is exactly what all astronomers seem to have to do. The effect is called aberration. Airy then filled his telescope with water which is supposed to slow light to 77% of  $c$ . Only earth motion, and not star motion, would affect the amount of **additional tilt** required on the telescope. Airy was supposed to have to tilt his telescope more to see a star than with no water in the telescope. He **did not**, the experiment is known as "**Airy's failure.**" I studied it in college, but nothing was made of it. In some respects it may be the most important experiment in the history of physics. A variety of "theories" were invoked to "explain" the *failure*: Fresnell Drag, shrinking of the tube in the direction of earth motion, expansion of the tube perpendicular to earth motion, and various combinations. Remember, it was only a *failure* because it did not agree with Copernicus, Gallileo, et al.

Several more experiments were attempted. All optical experiments, which should measure absolute motion, failed to detect any. Next, in 1881, came the grand-daddy of physics experiments, **Michelson-Morley**. You should be able to read about this experiment in any library. Basically it passed light in a round trip parallel to earth motion and another perpendicular to it. At first glance, it appears the time should be equal, but the math shows that light traveling perpendicular to *earth motion* will make the round trip faster. Performed more than once over a six-year period the results were always null, essentially no difference.

Many explanations were offered. 1. Space (or the aether) was dragged with the earth (Space was understood to contain a medium, *aether*. The term has been dropped, but *modern physics* teaches that space is filled with fields and particles), 2. Other velocities of the *aether* masked the earth's *known velocity*, 3. Error in calculations or experimental design, 4. Equipment defect, 5. Unknown phenomenon, 6. The earth was not moving. The experiment was duplicated many times by others, thousands of times by Miller of Case Institute (Cleveland) in the 1920's and 30's who actually consistently measured a small motion, but contended his results were consistent with earlier experiments, no earth motion.

By this time "everybody" was in the act with "explanations," which were far too numerous for this essay. The debate was well covered in Physics Journals, the Am Journal of Science, and Nature from 1881 through 1955 and involved the Who's Who of physics. Regardless of the noise, all tests of earth motion have failed and many competent *scientists* including Fred Hoyle and Einstein have conceded that there is no

physical difference between an earth centered and sun centered solar system.

"Michelson-Morley" had a great impact on a young man named Albert Einstein. When you pick up any book on "Relativity Theory" you are confronted by a lengthy, boring, monologue on mathematical transformations which have nothing to do with the theory itself. These are used as apologetics for Relativity, books seldom explain what Relativity really is. Einstein proposed to settle the issue by declaring that the velocity of light was an **absolute**, independent of the velocity of the source or the receptor. Meditation convinced me the notion is irrational, but you may conclude otherwise. Einstein is said to have made some "risky predictions" which helped convince many. But, if you know anything about data, you know that when you have problems fitting a mathematical curve to data, you can always propose, a new curve, to fit the data better. As long as you continue to work in that framework, the curve may fit future observations as well, which, in essence, is what Einstein did. By plugging relativity into earlier equations, some newly discovered phenomena were *explained by relativity*. These new observations are called *relativity effects* because *classical* physics supposedly did not predict them, but *relativity* did.

I suspect that the motive for Relativity (being proposed and for it's acceptance) was related more to Michelson-Morely and the religious-philosophical implications of an earth that did not move, than to any data. Though the debate raged into the '50's, the politically correct solution quickly became that Einstein had settled the issue.

It is a **fact** that other explanations can and have been proposed. Tom Barnes was a physics professor at Texas A & M. I met Tom in 1983, a fact I hope will help get me into heaven because I am sure he is there. His graduate students were busily deriving all the classical physics equations without any need for *relativity*. An electron moving in a field generates a smaller field. Barnes merely assumed the small field would "feed back," so he added a feedback term to classical equations. He was obviously right. This led Barnes to propose a new model of the atom. A tiny minority of physicists, some Christian, some atheist supported him. His model, with his support, has been modified greatly, but still apparently has some problems. The implications are astounding! To Beckman, an atheist,  $c$ , rather than being absolute is the main **variable**. Field strength in the solar system is far greater than in deep space, so " $c$ " is a mere 186,000mps here, but (virtually?) infinite elsewhere.

My point here is **not** that Barnes, or anyone else, is right. **I do not know who is right!!** My point is that none of these ideas have been exhaustively pursued, none of them have been proven correct and none of them currently explains all observed phenomena without closing your eyes or tossing in ad hoc theories. Most of them are ignored in favor of psychedelic thrills from *relativity* and *quantum physics*.

Example: Relativity did not begin to explain all phenomena. Quantum Physics was thrown in, which made Einstein gag. To others, it is god. The Nobel winner, Ilya Prigogine however said QP was, **at best, an incomplete theory**. Everything in QP is *conceived*, **never observed**. And everything is *conceived* to be **reversible**. But, Prigogine said "I can sit here in my lab and observe **irreversible events**." Events produce *particles* which supposedly survive for only fractions of a second. QP *events* are *conceived as virtual* and produce *virtual particles*. These *virtual particles do not exist, even in the mind of the quantum*

Use this coupon to request:	Quantity	Amount
Lending Library Catalog	_____	No Charge
Book, audio and video tape catalog	_____	No Charge
Reprints of feature articles from CSA News: (1 copy - \$1.00, 20 - \$4.00, 100 - \$17.00)	_____	_____
<b>Audio/Video Special (Jan - Feb, 2000)</b>	_____	_____
<b>Meeting Videos</b> (specify date or #)	_____	_____
<b>Meeting Audios</b> (specify date or #)	_____	_____
Other items	_____	_____
<b>Membership</b>	_____	_____
Postage: \$1.50/audio, \$2.00/ book or video	_____	_____
Total	_____	_____
Keep me on the mailing list	_____	_____

**Join and Support CSA**

Over 8300 people receive **CSA News** which is free for the asking. Please consider supporting our work. Many say **CSA News** is the first thing they read. If you don't, help us be good stewards by removing your name. Write or call:

**CSA, 22509 State Line Road  
Cleveland, MO 64734**

**Phone: (816) 618-3610 FAX: (816) 658-3253**  
**Important: New Phone Number is a KC Phone.**  
**Full Membership: \$17.00 per year**  
**Sustaining Membership: \$100 per year**  
**Associate Membership: \$5.00 per year**

**Cut out coupon at the left, return with your address label**

**physicist.** They typically exist only as mathematical tricks. It is fine to use mathematical tricks as computational aids. It is absurd to pretend that these exercises represent reality. We shall see later this happens frequently.

**Interim Conclusions:** Some feel *Modern Science* has cured *Classical Science* of a few minor illnesses. I'm suggesting that perhaps a closet full of cheap, psychedelic drugs has relieved **some** symptoms caused by **some** (minor?) birth defects in *classical science*. This is not restricted to physics, it most certainly includes biology.

TO BE CONTINUED

**Book of the Month**

**Tornado in a Junkyard**  
**The Relentless Myth of Darwinism**

*by: James Perloff*

This new book may be one of the very best. Easy reading, loaded with great quotes and very well illustrated, this could be an excellent resource book for student papers, or just the right book for Uncle Fred. 321 Pages, Soft Cover

**Regular Price: \$16.00. Special Jan/Feb: \$14.00**

**Audio/Video Tapes of CSA Meetings:**

**Textbook "Evidence" for Evolution**

*by: Bob Farwell*

Bob should know, he's taught from these textbooks for nearly 30 years. What do they really tell your children? ...and is it good science?.

**Audio A0178: \$5.00. Video: V0178 - \$13.00**

**Audio/Video Tapes of CSA Meetings:**

**The Origin of Fossils and Rocks**  
**The Myth of Uniformitarian Geology**

*by: Tom Willis*

Darwin was sold on millions of years by a Lawyer, Charles Lyell, whom he read while on his famous world cruise. Was Lyell right? Or did he just make a sucker out of Darwin and many others?

**Audio: A0177 - \$5.00. Video: V0177 - \$13.00**

**CSA Bumper Stickers: 3-3/4" x 17"**  
**Black on Bright Yellow,**  
**Price: 1: \$1.75, 5: \$7.00, 10: \$13.00, 50: \$50, 100: \$70**



**Too Far Away To Attend CSA Meetings?  
Why Not Attend Via Audio or Video Tape**

*Attend* CSA Meetings by ordering the Audio (\$5.00) or Video (\$13.00) tape by requesting the meeting date, topic, or item number (at the end of the meeting announcement), e.g. V0188. Basic and Advanced Session tapes may also be checked out of the library:

**The CSA Lending Library - Librarian: Larry Rink  
8904 Mastin, Overland Park, Ks 66212, (913) 492-6545**

**Are You Participating in CSA As Much as You Should?**

*"The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few."* Are you doing all the Lord has called you to do in the war for the minds and hearts of our citizens... especially our youth? CSA is not a closed fraternity. Any born-again believer who is abiding in the words of Jesus, and has been gifted in research, computers, speaking, clerical activities, writing of articles or book reviews, etc., and who has heard a call to serve in an origins ministry should consider and pray about serving with us. Write or call for more information.

© Copyright 1999

**The Creation Science Association  
for Mid-America**

22509 State Line Road Cleveland, MO. 64734  
Phone: (816) 618-3610 FAX: (816) 658-3253  
Email: CSAHQ@juno.com

Non-profit Org  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Permit #2  
Cleveland, MO

**BULK RATE**

**Address Service Requested**

**CSA Monthly Meeting Location: Westbrooke Church 9898 West 95th, Overland Park, KS**

Two blocks East of 69 Highway (or Switzer) on North side of 95th Street

**Refreshments: 6:15PM - Meeting: 7:00PM Nursery Available: \$2.50 per child** (Reservations required for nursery)

**CSA Meeting - Tuesday, Jan 4, 2000**

The Basic Institute in Creation Science

**God's Design & Purpose in Creation**

*by: Glenn Kailer*

All complex systems are created, all have purpose, both the creator and the true purpose precede, are external to, transcend and "sandwich" the system. Purpose before is the only reason for the system to exist, purpose after reflects its ultimate value. God's purposes are mentioned countless times in Scripture. Without knowledge and acceptance of the purpose of a system (including human ones), proper use of the system cannot be discussed. Spiritual warfare is the battle to restore and maintain God's true purpose for human "systems." (Tapes: A0201: \$5.00 or V0201: \$13.00)

**The Advanced Institute in Creation Science  
A Biblical Geologic Model**

*by: Tasman Bruce Walker, Ph.D.*

**Both Advanced Sessions are Videos of Papers Presented  
at the 1994 International Conference on Creation**

Any truly valid geologic theory would have to agree with Scripture, but, since the primary purpose of Scripture does not appear to be to provide one, it seems impossible to some, ridiculous to some, difficult but possible to others. Walker is one of the latter. [IC94T-007]

**Visit us at [www.csama.org](http://www.csama.org)**

Special Youth Sessions at CSA Meetings  
for High School Students. 7:00 - 8:30PM.

**November 2: "Our Solar System" - Moody Science**

**February 8: "Planet Earth" - Moody Science**

Discussion led by Cal Myers, Ph.D.

**CSA Meeting - Tuesday, Feb 1, 2000**

The Basic Institute in Creation Science

**Why Are Redbirds Red?**

*by: Tom Willis*

A bright 6-year old gave the standard answer, "To help them get a mate." "Why are pheasants brown?" Same girl + many others, "To help them hide." "How do redbirds, bluebirds and crows hide?" Silence. "Redbirds painted brown still mate properly." Silence. "Why do animals migrate?" "To escape the cold." "How about salmon?" "To Spawn." "Sea turtle babies migrate 3000 miles horizontally to a place they've never been. Why?" Finally, "Because God made them that way?" Very good, but we can do better. Do you know the best answers?

(Tapes: A0202, \$5.00 or V0202 \$13.00)

**The Advanced Institute in Creation Science  
Basic Types of Life**

*Siegfried Scherer, Ph.D.*

Scherer is a biologist who heads a team of 30 other biologists in Germany. My impression is that he is a true Christian. His work in seeking the "Basic Types of Life" (the Created *Kinds*) may be the most important since Linnaeus, and far closer to the right track than Linnaeus ever got. [IC94T-003]

**CSA  
Real Scientists  
Just Say NO!  
Seminar**

**Have you had one in your  
Community, School or  
Church lately? Contact  
CSA for info.**

