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”

Part 4

by Tom Willis

Previous segments of this article appeared in the Jan/Feb, Mar/Apr, and May/June, 2000 CSA News, which you must read if you expect to understand this segment. We have been discussing claims by a Challenger (C) to a fellow Toiler in the Creation vineyard (T). A few of you have written saying it is over your head. You will see that it isn’t, if you read to the conclusion.

We have presented much background and covered Claim 1. “That Quantum Physics has invalidated The Law of Cause and Effect.” Last issue, we began claim 2.

Claim 2: (Continued) Quantum Physics has Refuted the 1st Law of Thermodynamics (the Conservation Law).

The 1st Law, which all chemical and physical transactions obey, is that the amount of matter/energy will be “conserved,” i.e., remain constant “C’s” “proof” that the 1st Law had been refuted was this paragraph from “books” by (one of?) Capra, Gribbon and Zukar - “all respected and renowned physics authors:”

“Protons, like electrons, can interact with themselves in more ways than one. The simplest proton self-interaction is the emission and re-absorption, within the time permitted by the uncertainty principle, of a virtual pion. This interaction is analogous to an electron emitting and re-adsorbing a virtual photon. First there is a proton, then there is a proton and a neutral pion, then there is a proton again. [a diagram by Feynman was provided which was nothing more than a grammar school drawing of the claim]. The new proton and the neutral pion constitute a violation of the conservation law of mass-energy since their mass together is greater than the mass of the original proton.”

“C” also provided paragraphs which appeared to be from other books which offered the following:
The distinction between matter and empty space finally had to be abandoned... The vacuum is far from empty. On the contrary, it contains an unlimited number of particles which come into being and vanish without end.

And then this paragraph:
The right way to think of a vacuum is not as ‘nothing at all’ but as a superposition of many different states of the electromagnetic field (you can add other fields as well...).

My Comments: 1. Authors respected by whom? Capra is a promoter of New Age and Zen using philosophy which he calls “physics” as his apologetic. 2. Particles in fields have always “produced” things, but, because of the energy in the field, they are not violating the conservation law. Therefore it is irrational to suggest that particles existing in “any number of fields” are producing “something from nothing.” Even if they were, how would you know? 3. Invocation of the “uncertainty principle” is fascinating. This “principle” is nothing more than a pseudo-philosophical statement of the fact, illustrated by my graphic (last issue), that man’s technology is too weak to allow him to discover exactly what things, events, velocities, locations and processes exist in the atom. It is much better to confess your ignorance than to elevate it to evidence that God is notneeded and fundamental principles of physics have been disproved. 4. Even without the “fields” and “unlimited” other particles in the vacuum, the purported “emission of virtual particles” which last a fraction of a second would be a poor excuse to throw away your “classic physics” books, much less your Bible. 5. If empty space is truly full of particles and fields, then “heavens to muragtroy,” the pagan Aristotle was right, and the Christian Pascal wrong... “Nature does abhor a vacuum.” That’s a joke, son.

(continued on next page)
Claim 3: Quantum Physics Refutes the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics

The claim: "The theory of growing disorder, or 'increasing entropy,' is called the second law of thermodynamics. The [2nd law] is statistical. That means it won't work unless there are many entities in a given situation to apply it to. Generally speaking, individual subatomic particles are conceived as such conceptually isolated, short-lived entities that the [2nd law] does not apply to them."

Comments: 1. No evidence was even discussed, the claim was merely presented in this single paragraph. 2. Even if the 2nd Law was only statistical (which, in one sense, it is), it is absurd to claim it does not apply to individual particles. An automobile can be conceived as a particle, I suppose we should claim the 2nd Law will not affect automobiles. Unfortunately, all automobiles behave consistently with the 2nd Law, they decay. Incidentally, with input of external energy, they decay faster, as does everything else we can readily observe. Therefore, the 2nd Law certainly applies to large particles (automobiles) and there is every reason to suspect it applies to small ones as well. His own "evidence" supports this, he claims they disappear as fast as they appear. A very good reason for believing decay occurs in all particles is the Bible clearly says so (Romans 8:21). 3. I'm from Missouri, show me an "individual particle" that does not decay, much less grows in complexity over time. 4. "Conceiving" properties of particles that agree with your religion hardly constitutes evidence and sound reason for those properties.

Claim 4: Creationists debunk "traditional scientific theories about evolution (Darwinism and Neo Darwinism) while ignoring current evolutionary ideas - which have been prominent for over 30 years."

Comments: 1. No evidence was provided and the "current ideas" were not mentioned. 2. Textbooks, TV SHOWS, and most scientists teach 'Darwinism' And 'Neo Darwinism.' Toiler was right to concentrate on it. 3. Perhaps "C" meant punctuationalism. Many years ago a PhD pulled that on me after I had destroyed gradualism in a radio debate. He said that Gould (Harvard) had all this marvelous new stuff called "Punctuated Equilibrium." I tried to contain my delight as I hoped to pin him down by asking "Well, do you agree with punctuated equilibrium?" His answer, "Well I don't know, I'm not a biologist." It is difficult discussing ideas people believe are wonderful but don't know anything about. "C" has gone even further, he demands you refute theories that he won't even name, much less present evidence for. This is a rather common occurrence in origins discussions. 4. Evolutionists have made every conceivable claim about how it all happened. You could fill Grand Canyon with books refuting every claim they have made. Someone would still jump up and yell, "Well, that's old stuff, no one believes that anymore. We have a new theory." And so they do. Because evolution isn't science, but apologetic mythology for atheists, pantheists and homemade Christians, they will always need a new theory, and will always have one. They must have one, or they must change their religion.

The Real Purpose of This Essay?

Well, of course, it was to provide answers to these rather common claims (lately) for my friend and for others. But there is a more profound purpose. Listen carefully. Traditionally "science" is divided into various disciplines (chemistry, physics, etc.), and also into at least two broad divisions, "theoretical, or pure science" and "technology" or "applied science." The names of both are misleading. Technology is certainly not "applied theoretical science" as the traditional name implies. Technology has virtually always led theoretical science, and often been severely retarded by it. Grolier Encyclopedia sums it up: "It is a myth that our high technology society derives from the [theoretical/academic] laboratory..."

The two do have much in common. Practitioners of both will have motives involving approval by their peers, prestige, financial reward, personal satisfaction, etc. Both involve theory, and neither are specifically interested in truth. The technologist typically does not concern himself whether his technique is "true" or "the best" or "the only" way. His main concern is whether it will work at a reasonable cost. But the main distinguishing characteristic is that the technologist seeks to utilize phenomena, usually to "improve" the way mankind does things. But, the theoretician seeks to explain phenomena. Thus, the theoretician tends today, as he always has, to be a philosopher. The technologist, may enjoy philosophy, but he tends to be more a maker, builder, engineer. Generally, to make a living, the ideas of a technologist must work, while the philosopher need only have his ideas published. Price, performance, consistency, reliability and durability determine acceptance of technology, but philosophical and religious "usefulness" are the key factors in acceptance of "explanations" (hypotheses, theories, etc.) in theoretical science.

God's comments on these two fields are also instructive. God commanded man to "multiply and subdue the earth (technology) (Gen 1:28) and commented (at Babel) that man was already doing that on a tremendous scale, shortly after the flood (Gen 11:6). Man has certainly continued to develop technology on an enormous scale, building trains, cars, computers, airplanes, spacecraft, robots and countless other incredible devices. God's comments on philosophy, however, are always derogatory, linking it to "vain deceit, after the tradition of men" (Col 2:8), "science falsely so-called," (1 Tim 6:20) etc. The claims of theoretical science are certainly staggering, as the prior three segments of this essay discussed, but the "track record" is abysmal: Science does not know what matter is, where it came from, how it could be here for so long, or how it could come into existence. Science has no coherent "explanation" for stars or galaxies. Science does not know what light or electrons are, or whether they are particles or waves (to say they are both is irrational). Science doesn't know what an atom is, nor of what it is composed, or what holds it together. Scientists give names to their ignorance, saying the "weak force" and "strong force" hold the atom together, but we have no idea of their nature or source. They say "gravity" holds the solar system together, but have no idea of its source or how it could affect planets millions of miles away. Newton (who formalized gravitational theory) said it was irrational to believe it, and Einstein said gravity was superstition.

Science doesn't even know what space is, whether it is empty or full of "all sorts of fields and particles." Science is not sure what it is measuring when they "measure" light's velocity, or whether anything can go faster that light. Science doesn't know what moves or what doesn't in the cosmos. Einstein said we would never know, Sir Fred Hoyle said "there is no physical difference..."
between a sun-centered theory of the solar system and an earth-centered one.

Nor does science know what life is, much less how to create it or how the enormous variety of living structures came to be. Some people claim they can end life, but they cannot. Like matter, they can transform it, but cannot destroy it. Jesus put it this way, “Destroy this temple (his body) and in three days, I will raise it up.” (John 2:19) And, so he did.

Science does not know how to create or destroy any of these basic entities of the Cosmos (including space, matter, energy, light, life) thus, science does not really know anything!! Yet scientists demand we pay them to teach millions of children that they do know all these things!! Such claims, rather than being testimony to the quality of science, are testimony to the depravity of hearts, which, exactly as God claims, rather than being testimony to the quality of science, bases his life on theoretical science (philosophy), rather than on the Word of the eternal God, has been deceived, either by himself or by others. Anyone who advises a child to base his life on “science,” should not be surprised when he receives the terrible punishment promised by God in Matthew 18:6 and Mark 9:42.

The best science remains: “In him (Jesus Christ) all things consist” The best and only purpose man has is to love the Lord God with all our heart soul and mind, and love our neighbor as ourself (Matt 22:37-39).
Few people realize that the leadership of the “scientific community” has declared war on truth. They despise truth as much as they hate God. But they don’t really hate religion, because that is what science has become. What is really going on? How did we get to where we are? Was there really ever a “good” period in the history of science, or was Rushdooney right (In The Mythology of Science)? Is there any hope for improvement?
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The number of people in history who have attempted to teach us the right way to acquire scientific knowledge seems nearly infinite. The last couple centuries God’s enemies have shouted so loud no one else could be heard. It’s refreshing to hear another voice.
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Few people realize that the leadership of the “scientific community” has declared war on truth. They despise truth as much as they hate God. But they don’t really hate religion, because that is what science has become. What is really going on? How did we get to where we are? Was there really ever a “good” period in the history of science, or was Rushdooney right (In The Mythology of Science)? Is there any hope for improvement?
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The 2nd Law of Thermodynamics seems to be man’s effort to quantify what the Bible calls “the curse” and “the bondage to decay.” It is known to affect all chemical, physical and thus, life processes. Glenn suggests that it affects all human relationships and, as in origins discussions, can only be reversed by creative acts by a competent creator.
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Video from the 1994 International Conference on Creation

Aardsma has a knack for staying out of the “mainstream.” Frequently this penchant leads you astray, but, if there truly are any new ideas, they must come from outside the mainstream, else they wouldn’t be new. [IC94T-023]