

On November 30, 2009, I sent the below email to the president of the New York Academy of Sciences (Ellis Rubinstein) and the three speakers at an event honoring the 150th anniversary of the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*: Gerald M. Edelman (The Neurosciences Institute and The Scripps Research Institute), Paul Ekman (University of California, San Francisco and Paul Ekman Group LLC), and Terrence Deacon (University of California, Berkeley).

Dear Dr. Rubinstein,

I attended the November 24 event at the New York Academy of Sciences, which included a question and answer period that was broadcasted over the internet. After telling the panel of experts I made a video on YouTube titled, "The Truth About Evolution and Religion," I said: 1) Evolution applies only to the bodies of humans, not their souls. 2) Natural selection only explains the adaptation of organisms to their environment, not the increase in the complexity of organisms as they evolved from bacteria to mammals. (The evolution of bacteria to mammals is called *common descent*).

The panel did not respond to the first point. I feel the panel's response to the second point was a prevarication. My opinion that Darwinism explains only adaptation is based on my reading of *The Plausibility of Life: Resolving Darwin's Dilemma* by Marc W. Kirschner and John C. Gerhart, *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism* by Michael J. Behe, and *Only a Theory: Saving the Soul of America* by Kenneth Miller.

The following is a quote about the evolution of complexity from *The First Word: The Search for the Origins of Language* by Christine Kenneally:

They [Pinker and Bloom] particularly emphasized that language is incredibly complex, as Chomsky had been saying for decades. Indeed, it was the enormous complexity of language that made it hard to imagine not merely how it had evolved but that it had evolved at all.

But, continued Pinker and Bloom, complexity is not a problem for evolution. Consider the eye. The little organ is composed of many specialized parts, each delicately calibrated to perform its role in conjunction with the others. It includes the cornea,...Even Darwin said that it was hard to image how the eye could have evolved.

And yet, he explained, it did evolve, and the only possible way is through natural selection—the inestimable back-and-forth of random genetic mutation with small effects...Over the eons, those small changes accreted and eventually resulted in the eye as we know it. (pp. 59–60)

The panel said pretty much the same thing Dr. Kenneally said. The audience included many high school students, and the panel let it think that natural selection explains common descent. I think the panel and the NYAS should make amends. One way this can be done is by providing the attendees with the link to my YouTube video:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qKaF8vX6HXQ>

Very truly yours,

David Roemer  
347-365-4583

345 Webster Ave., Apt. 4-0  
Brooklyn, NY 11230  
February 26, 2013

Ellis Rubinstein

Office of President  
500 W. 185<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10033

Dear Mr. Rubinstein,

As a member of The American Association for the Advancement of Science, I think you have a special duty to respond to the open letter below. In addition, you can be of service to the physics departments of Columbia, Yeshiva, St. Johns, Fordham, CCNY, New York University, and Queens College. I've mailed letters to the presidents of these organizations questioning the character of the department chairs for not responding to my invitation to a lecture explaining why the attached article ("Entropy and evolution") should be retracted.

Dr. Fredy Zypman is not supporting my efforts to get the *American Journal of Physics* to retract an article published in November, 2008 ("Entropy and evolution," Am. J. Phys., Vol. 76, No. 11). This article disseminates misinformation about evolutionary biology and has no scientific value. The AJP is not following accepted procedures for a peer-reviewed article when an error has been pointed out. By his silence and inaction, Zypman and Yeshiva U. are helping the AJP cover up its mistake. The Catholic Truth of Scotland published an essay I wrote in May, 2012, about this because of the connection between evolution and religious faith in the minds of many people. The following link makes it clear to anyone why the AJP article is absurd:

[http://creationwiki.org/Pseudoscience\\_in\\_the\\_American\\_Journal\\_of\\_Physics](http://creationwiki.org/Pseudoscience_in_the_American_Journal_of_Physics).

Dr. Stephen Barr and Dr. Randy Isaac are two prominent physicists who write about evolution and religion and who are Christians. They are also guilty of supporting the actions of the AJP and its publishers. Barr angrily wrote to me saying that I was wrong and was harming the Catholic Church. Isaac offered to "walk me through" the matter. Barr and Isaac were sincere at first, but their behavior changed for the worse when I replied to their condescending response to my allegations. This does not Zypman's lack of interest, but rather shows how important it is for the AJP to retract the article.

The theory of evolution is that mammals evolved from bacteria over a period of 3.5 billion years. Many who call this theory a fact think the theory that free will is an illusion is also a fact. Both theories are related to religious faith. Religion causes conflict between people, and conflict causes anxiety. Inhibition is a defense mechanism against anxiety, and many scientists are inhibited from thinking intelligently and rationally and behaving honestly about evolution.

Fact or theory, evolution gives rise to the question of what caused it. The theory of natural selection only explains the adaptation of species to the environment. In other words, natural selection explains why giraffes have long necks, but not how giraffes evolved from bacteria in only 3.5 billion years. Evolutionary biologists always speak of “adaptive evolution.”

This limitation of the explanatory power of natural selection gives rise to the erroneous idea that evolution violates the laws of physics, specifically the second law of thermodynamics. The second law of thermodynamics states that nature tends to go from order to disorder and that entropy either increases or remains the same. Entropy is a thermodynamic variable related to heat and temperature. The truth is that the second law of thermodynamics does not apply to the evolution of stars or biological evolution.

The AJP article says the second law is not violated because it only applies to isolated systems, not systems exposed to sunlight. This reasoning is unintelligible. The idea that evolution violates the second law is intelligible, but simply wrong. What makes the AJP article morally offensive is that it misapplies a standard thermodynamic equation to prove that the second law of thermodynamics is not violated. Anyone who can't see that the calculation is nonsense should not be teaching thermodynamics. Anyone who remains silent about this outrageous article is a moral coward.

Very truly yours,

David Roemer

<http://www.newevangelization.info>

347-417-4703

Mailed with certificate of mailing