



David Roemer &lt;david@dkroemer.com&gt;

## Fwd: FYI: Lawsuit

2 messages

**James Stump** <james.stump@biologos.org>  
To: David Roemer <david@dkroemer.com>

Thu, May 4, 2017 at 9:09 PM

Dear David,

I don't understand why you're sending this to me. When you say "the scientific fact that humans did not evolve from animals" you are misusing language. Evolution is a theory that explains the observable evidence. Facts are the things we can directly observe (though even these are usually chock full of theory, as in "theory-laden observation"). You have an alternate explanation, I presume God's special creation of human beings apart from the rest of the creatures. That theory does a good job explaining what some people think are "facts" from Scripture, but it is woefully deficient in explaining what we find in nature. And it is not a "fact" in the sense of something directly observable (every human we've ever seen had parents). Yes, there are a few loud mouths who publish popular books that turn evolution into a kind of religion. But the vast, vast majority of biologists go about their business trying to understand some small bit of the natural world. The theory of evolution makes sense of their findings in a vastly superior way to supposing humans (and other species) dropped out of thin air. And when those biologists do uncover and make further sense of something, we say "To God be the glory, great things he hath done."

If you sent me your treatise looking for advice, my advice is to channel your energy toward something else.

Best,

Jim

**Jim Stump**

Senior Editor

800.405.5798 | [616.328.5208](tel:616.328.5208) | [biologos.org](http://biologos.org)

2100 Raybrook SE Suite 200 Grand Rapids, MI 49546



On Thu, May 4, 2017 at 11:46 AM, Info BioLogos <[info@biologos.org](mailto:info@biologos.org)> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **David Roemer** <[david@dkroemer.com](mailto:david@dkroemer.com)>

Date: Thu, May 4, 2017 at 6:20 AM

Subject: Request for Help

To: Jim Stump <[info@biologos.org](mailto:info@biologos.org)>

Dear Jim,

I filed a First Amendment lawsuit against Columbia University that is now before the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (Docket No. 17-818). This lawsuit is analogous to *Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District* (2005), which barred public schools from teaching the theory called "Intelligent Design." In 17-818, the state actor is the General Counsel of Columbia and a department of the New York State Unified Court System. The scientific question concerns not how elephants evolved from bacteria, but the cosmological argument for God's existence. I explain in the attached brief that the cosmological argument is based on the scientific fact that human beings did not evolve from animals. The other attached file is a reference to the famous Scopes Monkey Trial.

I'm accusing New York State of promoting the religion called humanism. In the United States, many humanists have a church, a pastor, and a creed. What makes humanism a religion under the First Amendment, however, is the fact that humanists discriminate against people who believe in God. Humanists also consciously and unconsciously disseminate misinformation about history and science to promote their religion. An example of discrimination can be found in Wikipedia's entry titled, "Sternberg peer review controversy."

What follows is a list of truths about evolutionary biology that many non-biologists don't know because of humanistic pseudoscience and misinformation:

1. Charles Darwin contributed nothing to biological evolution. Pierre Louis Maupertuis in the 18th century and al-Jāhīz in the 9th century invented the theory of natural selection. Darwin was just a propagandist for eugenics.
2. The theory of evolution is more accurately called the theory of common descent with modifications because of how rapidly bacteria evolved into elephants and how much more complex an elephant is than a bacteria.
3. The branch of science called biology does not address the mind-body problem because the mind-body problem is a philosophical or metaphysical question.
4. Natural selection is just one proposed mechanism for common descent. Three other mechanisms are epigenetics, natural genetic engineering, and facilitated variation. All these mechanisms only explain why giraffes have long necks, not how giraffes descended from worms. No biologist claims these mechanisms explain common descent.
5. Biological evolution does not violate the second law of thermodynamics because the second law does not apply to biological systems, not because of energy supplied by the Sun.

The *American Journal of Physics* published an absurd article titled "Entropy and Evolution" (November 2008) with a calculation proving that #5 is not true. My correspondence about this scandal is at: <http://www.pseudoscience123.com>.

The following essay includes an account of the Sternberg scandal:  
[https://www.academia.edu/20939526/An\\_Analogy\\_Between\\_Nazi\\_Germany\\_and\\_the\\_United\\_States](https://www.academia.edu/20939526/An_Analogy_Between_Nazi_Germany_and_the_United_States)

Very truly yours,  
David Roemer  
<http://www.newevangelization.info>

--  
Blessings,  
BioLogos Team Member

--  
Blessings,  
BioLogos Team Member

---

**David Roemer** <david@dkroemer.com>  
To: James Stump <james.stump@biologos.org>

Fri, May 5, 2017 at 7:12 AM

Dear James,  
You are making the same mistake the district judge made when he dismissed my lawsuit. My complaint proves in paragraph 10 with footnotes 3 and 4 that human beings did not evolve from animals. I've attached a copy of the complaint.

You might have trouble understanding the quote from Stephen Jay Gould. I have rephrased it as follows:

"Catholics could believe whatever science determined about evolution, as long as they believed God gave human beings free will. Whatever my private beliefs about free will, science cannot touch such a subject."

[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **Amended Complaint.pdf**  
48K

## Myth About Charles Darwin

■ Open Forum

---



davidroemer

1m

Charles Darwin contributed nothing to biological evolution. Pierre Louis Maupertuis in the 18th century and al-Jāhīz in the 9th century invented the theory of natural selection. Darwin was just a propagandist for eugenics and atheism.

# Cosmological Argument for God's Existence

■ Open Forum

---



davidroemer

1m

The cosmological argument for God's existence is not based on the Big Bang or similar god-of-gaps arguments. It is based on the scientific fact that human beings did not evolve from animals. What evolved from animals is a hypothetical creature without free will and the conscious knowledge of human beings as opposed to the sense knowledge of animals. Because of our interaction with other human beings, we know that we are finite beings. Assuming that the universe is intelligible, means an infinite being exists. In the religions originating in the Near East, we call the infinite being *God*.

## ✉ Evolution and the Second Law ✎



davidroemer

1m

@jpm

<http://biologos.org/common-questions/scientific-evidence/evolution-and-the-second-law> makes the same mistake made in "Entropy and evolution" (Am. J. Phys., Vol. 76, No. 11, November 2008.) . The AJP actually mentions that the source of the error that evolution violates the second law is Henry Morris, a creationist. In other words, the article is about religion, not physics. Instead of saying a living organism does not have a temperature or an entropy, the AJP article says that the second law only applies to closed systems. Evolution did not take place in a closed system because the Earth was exposed to the sun while evolution was happening. The AJP article is even more absurd than the BioLogos article because it performs a calculation proving that the second law is not violated.

Temperature is the sensation of hot and cold. But, there is an equation for it using the Boltzmann constant and the average kinetic energy of the molecules. Entropy is not so easy to understand as temperature because it is an integral equation involving heat and temperature. There is also an equation for entropy using the Boltzmann constant and probability. If you have a gas with  $N$  molecules in a container of with a volume  $V$ , physicists break up the container into  $N$  compartments. The probability of finding all of the molecules in one of the compartments is the inverse of  $N$  factorial ( $N \times N-1 \times N-2 \times N-3 \dots$ ).

This is how irrational the AJP article is: Imagine stack of 52 paper napkins. This stack has a temperature and an entropy. Now imagine a deck of playing cards. Does a deck of playing cards have a temperature and entropy? Of course not. It is only in the minds of human beings that each card is different. As far as thermodynamics is concerned, a deck of cards is just like a stack of 52 napkins. The AJP article says that the entropy of the deck of cards is proportional to 52 factorial.



Bill\_II

3h

How about we all save a bunch of time and typing and just point out we have been down this road before?

[Evolution and 2nd law of thermodynamics](#) 1

Which just happens to be the most recent trip down memory lane that I could find.

Calling [@davidroemer](#)

1 Like



Reply



jpm Phil Moderator



Bill\_II

1h

Agree . Will close the topic as it covers ground that has been rehashed enough.

## 🔒 Misinformation About Evolution

■ Open Forum



davidroemer

2d

Natural selection is just one proposed mechanism for common descent. Three other mechanisms are epigenetics, natural genetic engineering, and facilitated variation. All these mechanisms only explain why giraffes have long necks, not how giraffes descended from worms. No biologist claims these mechanisms explain common descent.

May 7

1 / 66  
May 8



David Roemer &lt;david@dkroemer.com&gt;

---

**[The BioLogos Forum] [PM] New Scopes Monkey Trial Lawsuit**

---

**Brad Kramer** <no-reply@biologos.org>  
Reply-To: Brad Kramer <no-reply@biologos.org>  
To: david@dkroemer.com

Fri, May 5, 2017 at 4:08 PM



**Brad Kramer** BioLogos Managing Editor  
May 5

Hi [@davidroemer](#), thanks for joining the conversation. I have some concerns about the thread you created here, so I've hidden it from the public view until we can resolve them. First, we find that the best posts to start conversation are short and focused on a single point. Your post is far too long and suffers from lack of a clear main point. Second, I am uncomfortable with the amount of personal and legal information you shared, and I am wondering about your motivation for posting it publicly here. If you can explain your reasoning and edit the post accordingly, I will return it to public view.

Brad

[Visit Message](#) to respond.

To unsubscribe from these emails, [click here](#).



1 Like



**BradKramer**  BioLogos Managing Editor

1h

I'm closing this thread, as it very clear that [@davidroemer](#) is not able to put together coherent thoughts, for whatever reason. I appreciate those who have engaged with him, but this is just an exercise in frustration.

1 Like



CLOSED 1 HOUR AGO



David Roemer &lt;david@dkroemer.com&gt;

---

**[The BioLogos Forum] [PM] Ban**

---

**Casper Hesp** <no-reply@biologos.org>  
Reply-To: Casper Hesp <no-reply@biologos.org>  
To: david@dkroemer.com

Wed, May 10, 2017 at 3:56 PM



**Casper\_Hesp** Moderator  
May 10

Hi David,

It has become very clear to us (and basically all participants) that the BioLogos Forum is not the right place for you. We welcome people of all perspectives, but there are minimum requirements for the coherency of writing to allow for actual discourse between people. I am afraid we will have to make this a permanent ban. I pray for you to find people in your immediate surroundings with whom you could converse in more productive ways.

Greetings on behalf of the BioLogos moderator team,  
Casper

[Visit Message](#) to respond.

To unsubscribe from these emails, [click here](#).