

345 Webster Ave., Apt. 4-0  
Brooklyn, NY 11230  
May 4, 2015

Rush D. Holt  
American Association for the Advancement of Science  
1200 New York Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. Holt,

I just told every member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the United States House of Representatives about my request to explain to you in person why the *American Journal of Physics* should retract a malicious and absurd article titled, "Entropy and evolution." I have been writing about entropy and evolution since May 1, 2010, when I reviewed a book by Richard Dawkins that criticizes certain Christians for saying evolution violates the second law of thermodynamics. According to this law of nature, the entropy of an isolated liquid, solid, or gas always increases or remains constant. All of my correspondence with scientists, government officials, and private organizations is at <http://www.pseudoscience123.com>.

The mission statement of the AAAS promises to, "Promote and defend the integrity of science and its use." On October 18, 2002, the AAAS stated, "The lack of scientific warrant for so-called 'intelligent design theory' makes it improper to include as a part of science education." The AAAS should be against all pseudoscience, not just pseudoscience disseminated to promote religious faith.

On a personal level, we both have a Ph.D. in physics from New York University, and I buttonholed you about this matter on April 24, 2014. Also, I corresponded by email with Robert Richardson, who is a professor of physics at New York University. I wrote a letter to the President of New York University criticizing the behavior of Dr. Richardson and the character of the chair of the physics department. If you have the integrity or courage to meet with me, this is what I will explain to you:

## Arguments for God's Existence

There are two logically sound arguments for God's existence. The first is called the *cosmological argument* and the second is based on the objectivity of moral laws. The cosmological argument has nothing to do with the Big Bang, fine-tuning of physical constants, or the complexity of a living organism. It is based, rather, on the observation that human beings have free will. This means humans are finite beings and finite beings need a cause. If all beings needed a cause, the universe would not be intelligible. Hence, there exists an infinite being. In Western religions, we call the infinite being *God*.

In one of the Eastern religions, God is called *Dao*, which means "the way." This brings us to the second argument. If one person likes chocolate and another likes vanilla, you can't say one is right and the other is wrong. They simply have different

values. Suppose one person likes to torture and kill people. If you say such a person is wrong, you are implying that there exists a transcendent reality that makes that person's values wrong.

It is perfectly reasonable to say these arguments are not persuasive and that we don't know whether or not God exists. However, atheists and agnostics generally don't say and think this. What they say and think is, "We don't know whether or not God exists." They leave out references to the arguments either consciously or unconsciously because thinking about God causes anxiety, and inhibition is a defense mechanism for anxiety. Atheists and agnostics, I am suggesting, are inhibited from behaving reasonably, intelligently, and honestly about anything related to God's existence.

## The Theory of Evolution

The theory of evolution is that microscopic organisms evolved into whales over a period of about 100 million decades. I'm using decades as units instead of years or seconds because it takes 20 years for a single fertilized egg to produce all of the cells in a human body. You get a better insight into how rapidly evolution is supposed to have occurred by measuring the time in decades.

I am also emphasizing that the theory of evolution is indeed a theory because many people feel very strongly that it is some kind of fact. The most ridiculous thing these people say is that the term *theory* has a different meaning in science than it has in day-to-day life.

We see the fossils of animals that don't exist and ask where they came from. The answer or theory is biological evolution. Another example of a question and answer is: What is free will? One theory, popular among atheists and agnostics, is that free will is an illusion. There is a lot of evidence for evolution, but there is very little evidence free will is an illusion.

## The Theory of Intelligent Design

Fact or theory, evolution raises the question of what caused it. In the middle of the 18th century, Pierre Louis Maupertuis invented the theory of natural selection. Around 1800, Jean Baptiste Lamarck invented what is now called *epigenetics*. My understanding is that Charles Darwin contributed nothing to evolutionary biology. Other theories are natural genetic engineering and facilitated variation. These theories only explain the adaptation of species to the environment. They do not explain common descent. The only theory that even attempts to explain common descent is the theory of intelligent design (ID).

The trouble with ID is that there is no evidence for it. What advocates of ID consider to be evidence is really evidence that the universe is not intelligible. Advocates of ID generally believe in God. Just as atheists and agnostics are suffering from cognitive dissonance, advocates of ID are anxious about religion and inhibited from thinking rationally and intelligently.

## **Sternberg\_peer\_review\_controversy**

An example of misconduct caused by the conflict over evolution and religion can be seen from the title alone of a 27-page report written by a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in 2006: "Intolerance and the Politicization of Science at the Smithsonian: Smithsonian's Top Officials Permit the Demotion and Harassment of Scientist Skeptical of Darwinian Evolution." The scientist was Richard Sternberg who was an editor of the peer-reviewed journal of the Biological Society of Washington. He published an article promoting ID, and was publicly criticized by the Biological Society of Washington. He could not be penalized because his day job was at the Smithsonian. His colleagues there did the dirty work.

What Sternberg did was certainly wrong. The article was a review of the different theories about the Cambrian explosion 54 million decades ago. The reference to ID came at the end of the article, and the peer-reviewers thought it was a harmless philosophical addendum that did not detract from the scientific value of the paper. Sternberg should have deleted this reference, or at the very least, advised his fellow editors about the article. He published the article behind the backs of his colleagues.

I experienced the same kind of animus in my email exchanges with Professor Richardson. I think he found out I was a retired high school teacher, and saw fit to tell me that I could not afford to pay for his services.

## **Entropy and Evolution (Am. J. Phys., November 2008)**

The introduction of this paper correctly refutes the pseudoscience that evolution violates the second law of thermodynamics with the statement: "Disorder is a metaphor for entropy, not a definition."

The author then makes the following statement, which I find unintelligible: "Although the entropy of the universe increases with time, the entropy of any part of the universe can decrease with time, so long as that decrease is compensated by an even larger increase in some other part of the universe."

Consider what happens with energy and entropy when you place a hot block of metal in contact with a cold block of metal to create a bigger block of metal. Energy flows from the hot block to the cold block in accordance with the second law of thermodynamics. The amount of energy gained is equal to the amount of energy lost, just as when you buy a gallon of gas. The gas station is compensated for its loss of the gas with the dollars paid because there is a sense in which a gallon of gas is equal to \$2.50, or whatever the price is. The bigger block is not robbed of any energy.

Considering entropy instead of energy, the entropy of the cold block increases, the entropy of the hot block decreases, and the entropy of the bigger block increases. I can't understand why anyone would say the decrease in the entropy of the hot block is compensated for by the increase in the entropy of the cold block.

There is another way of proving that evolution does not violate the second law of thermodynamics because there is an equation that describes this law. If evolution

violated the second law, you could prove it by doing a calculation. The fact that no such calculation is possible proves the second law is not violated. This paper disgraces every physicist in the United States because it performs such a calculation to prove evolution does not violate the second law.

## Conclusion

According to Thomas Aquinas, the primary principle of morality is that we are responsible for our actions. Moral laws are secondary principles. Our conscience tells us whether or not circumstances justify saying things that are untrue or ending someone's life. In my opinion, there can never be a justification for pseudoscience. We don't need to consult our consciences because we can always follow the moral law against lying.

Also, I don't think there is such a thing as a small sin as opposed to a big sin because God is not injured when we do something wrong. This, I think, is the meaning of the exchange between Spencer Tracy, playing an American judge in the movie "Judgment at Nuremburg," and Burt Lancaster, playing a Nazi judge:  
Burt Lancaster: All those millions of people ... I never thought it would come to that.  
Spencer Tracy: It came to that when you sentenced an innocent man to death.

Very truly yours,

David Roemer

347-417-4703

Mailed with a certificate of mailing and emailed.