

<http://www.uncommondescent.com/intelligent-design/in-the-beginning-and-other-essays-on-intelligent-design-2nd-edition/#comment-554569>

Entropy Contradicts Darwinism

On a blog I participate on, a Darwinist, like a boy who didn't do his homework, recently (December 2014) made a flimsy excuse as to why Darwinism does not have a rigid mathematical basis:

<http://www.uncommondescent.com/news/horizontal-gene-transfer-discovered-from-bacteria-to-insects/#comment-534357>

He claimed,,,

"Many areas of science don't have a "rigid mathematical basis",

Yet, contrary to what he wants to believe to be true, ALL RIGID theories of physical science that claim to have vast explanatory power, such as General Relativity, Quantum Mechanics, Mechanics, Electrodynamics, Statistical Mechanics, ALL, i.e. EVERY ONE OF THEM, have a rigid mathematical basis that can be tested against to extreme levels of precision. You can see the foundational equations of modern science at the 24:30 minute mark of the following video or on Table 1 of the following paper:

Designed Universe - Walter Bradley PhD.- video (24:30 minute mark for list of equations)
<https://vimeo.com/105537135>

"Is There Scientific Evidence for the Existence of God?" Walter Bradley - paper

Excerpt: Only in the 20th century have we come to fully understand that the incredibly diverse phenomena that we observe in nature are the outworking of a very small number of physical laws, each of which may be described by a simple mathematical relationship. Indeed, so simple in mathematical form and small in number are these physical laws that they can all be written on one side of one sheet of paper, as seen in Table 1.

<http://www.leaderu.com/offices/bradley/docs/scievidence.html>

Yet, Darwinism is the only hypothesis in science that claims to be an overarching theory of science, and which claims to have vast explanatory power for how all life diversified on earth, (which is certainly not a minor claim for a supposedly 'scientific' theory to make), that has nothing of the sort that we can test against. Even Darwin himself admitted that his theory lacked the rigor of a proper science:

Science owes nothing to Darwinism – Jonathan Wells - November 24, 2014

Excerpt: In response to a letter from Asa Gray, professor of biology at Harvard University, Darwin declared: "I am quite conscious that my speculations run quite beyond the bounds of true science."

When questioned further by Gray, Darwin confirmed Gray's suspicions: "What you hint at generally is very, very true: that my work is grievously hypothetical, and large parts are by no means worthy of being called induction." Darwin had turned against the use of scientific principles in developing his theory of evolution.

<http://www.uncommondescent.com/darwinism/science-owes-nothing-to-darwinism-jonathan-wells/>

Indeed, Darwinism does not even appeal to any known physical laws of the universe, as other overarching theories of science do, so as to derive any of the so called 'predictions' of Darwinism, (forget all the major failed predictions of Darwinism for a moment!).

WHAT SCIENTIFIC IDEA IS READY FOR RETIREMENT? Evolution is True – Roger Highfield – January 2014

Excerpt:,,, Whatever the case, those universal truths—'laws'—that physicists and chemists all rely upon appear relatively absent from biology.

Little seems to have changed from a decade ago when the late and great John Maynard Smith wrote a chapter on evolutionary game theory for a book on the most powerful equations of science: his contribution did not include a single equation.

<http://www.edge.org/response-detail/25468>

Moreover, the Second Law of thermodynamics, which is based on rigid, testable, mathematics,,,

Shining Light on Dark Energy – October 21, 2012

Excerpt: It (Entropy) explains time; it explains every possible action in the universe;,,

Even gravity, Vedral argued, can be expressed as a consequence of the law of entropy. ,,,

The principles of thermodynamics are at their roots all to do with information theory. Information theory is simply an embodiment of how we interact with the universe —,,,

<http://crev.info/2012/10/shining-light-on-dark-energy/>

,,, Entropy is VERY antagonistic to any Darwinian claims of ever increasing functional complexity/information! In fact, entropy is the primary reason why our physical/material bodies grow old and die.

Entropy Explains Aging, Genetic Determinism Explains Longevity, and Undefined Terminology Explains Misunderstanding Both - 2007

Excerpt: There is a huge body of knowledge supporting the belief that age changes are characterized by increasing entropy, which results in the random loss of molecular fidelity, and accumulates to slowly overwhelm maintenance systems [1–4].,,,

<http://www.plosgenetics.org/article/info%3Adoi/10.1371/journal.pgen.0030220>

This following video, visually, brings the point very personally home to us about the degenerating effects of Entropy on our bodies as we grow older:

Aging Process - 85 years in 40 seconds - video
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A91Fwf_sMhk

And, unlike Darwinian claims for which I can find no substantiating evidence, these degenerating effects of entropy in biology are overwhelmingly borne out empirically,,,

Multiple Overlapping Genetic Codes Profoundly Reduce the Probability of Beneficial Mutation
George Montañez 1, Robert J. Marks II 2, Jorge Fernandez 3 and John C. Sanford 4 – May 2013

Excerpt: It is almost universally acknowledged that beneficial mutations are rare compared to deleterious mutations [1–10]., It appears that beneficial mutations may be too rare to actually allow the accurate measurement of how rare they are [11].

http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/pdf/10.1142/9789814508728_0006

“The First Rule of Adaptive Evolution”: Break or blunt any functional coded element whose loss would yield a net fitness gain – Michael Behe – December 2010

Excerpt: In its most recent issue The Quarterly Review of Biology has published a review by myself of laboratory evolution experiments of microbes going back four decades.,,, The gist of the paper is that so far the overwhelming number of adaptive (that is, helpful) mutations seen in laboratory evolution experiments are either loss or modification of function. Of course we had already known that the great majority of mutations that have a visible effect on an organism are deleterious. Now, surprisingly, it seems that even the great majority of helpful mutations degrade the genome to a greater or lesser extent.,,, I dub it “The First Rule of Adaptive Evolution”: Break or blunt any functional coded element whose loss would yield a net fitness gain.

<http://behe.uncommondescent.com/2010/12/the-first-rule-of-adaptive-evolution/>

Evolution vs. Genetic Entropy – Andy McIntosh – video
<https://vimeo.com/91162565>

Dr. John Sanford "Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Genome" 1/2 - video
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pJ-4umGkgos>

John Sanford on (Genetic Entropy) - Down, Not Up - 2-4-2012 (at Loma Linda University) - video
http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_detailpage&v=PHsu94HQrL0#t=1040s

Notes from John Sanford's preceding video:

- *3 new mutations every time a cell divides in your body

- * Average cell of 15 year old has up to 6000 mutations

- *Average cell of 60 year old has 40,000 mutations

Reproductive cells are 'designed' so that, early on in development, they are 'set aside' and thus they do not accumulate mutations as the rest of the cells of our bodies do. Regardless of this protective barrier against the accumulation of slightly detrimental mutations still we find that,,,

*60-175 mutations are passed on to each new generation.

Thus contrary to what Darwinists want to believe to be true, Darwinism is in fact a pseudo-science that not only does not have a rigid mathematical basis, but is in fact, a pseudo-science that almost directly contradicts a known theory of science (Entropy) that does have an extremely rigid mathematical basis in science:

"The law that entropy always increases holds, I think, the supreme position among the laws of Nature. If someone points out to you that your pet theory of the universe is in disagreement with Maxwell's equations — then so much the worse for Maxwell's equations. If it is found to be contradicted by observation — well, these experimentalists do bungle things sometimes. But if your theory is found to be against the second law of thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for it but to collapse in deepest humiliation."

Sir Arthur Stanley Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World* (1915), chapter 4

Moreover, Darwinists, instead of ever being honest to these crushing mathematical and empirical difficulties that Entropy presents to Darwinism, have used heavy handed tactics to try to censor any papers pointing these fatal problems with Entropy for Darwinism out,,,

Journal Apologizes and Pays \$10,000 After Censoring Article - Granville Sewell episode - June 2011

http://www.evolutionnews.org/2011/06/journal_apologizes_and_pays_10047121.html

Censorship Loses: Never Forget the Story of Biological Information: New Perspectives
Casey Luskin - August 20, 2013

http://www.evolutionnews.org/2013/08/censorship_lose075541.html

,,, and apart from the Darwinian red herring rhetoric about the Entropy of open systems not 'preventing' evolution from happening (which makes about as much sense as saying that the law of Gravity does not 'prevent' a two-tons of aluminum from flying,,, (but just try to make two-tons of aluminum fly without a massive input of functional information/complexity to make that two tons of aluminum fly!)),,,

"The laws of probability apply to open as well as closed systems."

Granville Sewell - Professor Of Mathematics - University Of Texas El Paso

Here is a video based on Granville Sewell's 2013 Biocomplexity paper

Biological Information - Entropy, Evolution and Open Systems 11-15-2014 by Paul Giam - video
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V_G9HtsfXfs

The Common Sense Law of Physics - Granville Sewell

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LB-ylAMJfxA&list=UUFtmZ8EmhTxzFJD6Uga9YTg>

„,Despite the red herring tactics from Darwinists about the Entropy of open systems not 'preventing' evolution from happening, the fact of the matter is that when the equations of thermodynamics are scrutinized, we find that purely material processes are not sufficient to explain why life exists in such a extremely high thermodynamically 'non-equilibrium' state. In the following paper, Andy C. McIntosh, professor of thermodynamics and combustion theory at the University of Leeds, holds that non-material information is what is constraining the cell to be in such an extremely high thermodynamic non-equilibrium state. Moreover, Dr. McIntosh holds that regarding information to be independent of energy and matter, instead of emergent from energy and matter, 'resolves the thermodynamic issues and invokes the correct paradigm for understanding the vital area of thermodynamic/organisational interactions'.

Information and Thermodynamics in Living Systems - Andy C. McIntosh - 2013

Excerpt: „, information is in fact non-material and that the coded information systems (such as, but not restricted to the coding of DNA in all living systems) is not defined at all by the biochemistry or physics of the molecules used to store the data. Rather than matter and energy defining the information sitting on the polymers of life, this approach posits that the reverse is in fact the case. Information has its definition outside the matter and energy on which it sits, and furthermore constrains it to operate in a highly non-equilibrium thermodynamic environment. This proposal resolves the thermodynamic issues and invokes the correct paradigm for understanding the vital area of thermodynamic/organisational interactions, which despite the efforts from alternative paradigms has not given a satisfactory explanation of the way information in systems operates.,,,

http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9789814508728_0008

Here is a recent video by Dr. Giem, that gets the main points of Dr. McIntosh's paper over very well for the lay person:

Biological Information – Information and Thermodynamics in Living Systems 11-22-2014 by Paul Giem (A. McIntosh) – video

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IR_r6mFdwQM

Of supplemental note: It is also very interesting to note that Ludwig Boltzmann, an atheist, when he linked entropy and probability, did not, as Max Planck, a Christian Theist, points out in the following link, think to look for a constant for entropy:

The Austrian physicist Ludwig Boltzmann first linked entropy and probability in 1877. However, the equation as shown, involving a specific constant, was first written down by Max Planck, the father of quantum mechanics in 1900. In his 1918 Nobel Prize lecture, Planck said: "This constant is often referred to as Boltzmann's constant, although, to my knowledge, Boltzmann himself never introduced it – a peculiar state of affairs, which can be explained by the fact that Boltzmann, as appears from his occasional utterances, never gave thought to the possibility of carrying out an exact measurement of the constant."

http://www.daviddarling.info/encyclopedia/B/Boltzmann_equation.html

I hold that the primary reason why Boltzmann, an atheist, never thought to carry out, or even propose, a precise measurement for the constant on entropy is that he, as an atheist, had thought he had arrived at the ultimate 'random' explanation for how everything in the universe operates when he had link probability with entropy. i.e. In linking entropy with probability, Boltzmann, again an atheist, thought he had explained everything that happens in the universe to a 'random' chance basis. To him, as an atheist, I hold that it would simply be unfathomable for him to conceive that the 'random chance' (probabilistic) events of entropy in the universe should ever be constrained by a constant that would limit the effects of 'random' entropic events of the universe. Whereas on the contrary, to a Christian Theist such as Planck, it is expected that even these seemingly random entropic events of the universe should be bounded by a constant. In fact modern science was born out of such 'Christian' thinking:

'Men became scientific because they expected Law in Nature, and they expected Law in Nature because they believed in a Legislator. In most modern scientists this belief has died: it will be interesting to see how long their confidence in uniformity survives it. Two significant developments have already appeared—the hypothesis of a lawless sub-nature, and the surrender of the claim that science is true.'

Lewis, C.S., *Miracles: a preliminary study*, Collins, London, p. 110, 1947.

Verse and Music:

Romans 8:20-21

For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the freedom and glory of the children of God.

Phillips, Craig & Dean - When The Stars Burn Down - Worship Video with lyrics

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rPuxnQ_vZqY