

Re: Richard Dawkins

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-06/msg00729.html>

- *From:* "Jong Kim" <rh171@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 7 Jun 2007 08:05:54 -0700
-

"RetroProphet" <RetroProphet_member@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:f45tbc02bgk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

(Reclaiming Science from Darwinism;
Kenneth Poppe):

These blind alleys dismissed, the book
(textbook) usually gives
the correct view for the origin of cellular
life, using Pasteur's
famous "soup in a flask" experiment.

Pasteur did not attempt and could not attempt to study
abiogenesis over
extended periods of time. He proved that life does not arise
in a
matter of days or weeks from non-life, but this does not
prove that
no self-replicating molecules could emerge over billions of
years.
Note that this has nothing to do with evolution or
"darwinism", since
evolution starts with the premise that self-replicating
systems already
exist and describes how they are modified. Abiogenesis
describes
possible chemical and physical route by which molecular
systems might
self-organize and become capable of autonomous
self-replication.
So, yet another chestnut of creationist stupidity has been shot
down
in flames.

Not so. Here's more evidence that Art Bulla is right, namely James Clerk

Re: Richard Dawkins

Maxwell's comments on natural molecular Evolution vs. divine work of Creation:

"No theory of evolution can be formed to account for the similarity of molecules, for evolution necessarily implies continuous change, and the molecule is incapable of growth or decay, of generation or destruction.

None of the processes of Nature, since the time when Nature began, have produced the slightest difference in the properties of any molecule. We are therefore unable to ascribe either the existence of the molecules or the identity of their properties to any of the causes which we call

natural."

Atoms and molecules did not always exist.
Maxwell didn't know this.

Pertaining to molecules (and therefore atoms also), coarse matter and not aether, Maxwell said in Sept. 1873, "matter cannot be eternal and self-existent".

While Maxwell was talking only about molecules, it is true that at the time of his 1873 discourse, atomic isotopes were unknown. There's also a connection between some isotopes and radioactivity.

<http://www.colorado.edu/physics/2000/isotopes/index.html>

Isotopes

Atoms of the same element can have different numbers of neutrons; the different possible versions of each element are called isotopes.

....

How many isotopes can one element have? Can an atom have just any number of neutrons?

No; there are "preferred" combinations of neutrons and protons, at which the forces holding nuclei together seem to balance best. Light elements tend to have about as many neutrons as protons; heavy elements apparently need more neutrons than protons in order to stick together. Atoms with a few too many neutrons, or not quite enough, can sometimes exist for a while, but they're unstable.

I'm not sure what you mean by "unstable." Do atoms just fall apart if they don't have the right number of neutrons?

Well, yes, in a way. Unstable atoms are radioactive: their nuclei change or decay by spitting out radiation, in the form of particles or electromagnetic waves.

[end of Isotope Q&A]

Re: Richard Dawkins

Re: Richard Dawkins

So, the very existence of atomic isotopes has a pattern and a hidden order to it, that it isn't of random variety. I suspect that any possible arrangement of matter can be mathematically described by applying the universal principle of stationary action, or metaphysically (spiritually)

speaking, the Law of Economy of Heaven. That, the nature of unstable or radioactive isotopes may be viewed in terms of maximal and/or 'saddle point' mathematical functions concerning atomic energies over time, i.e. the Lagrangian–Hamiltonian calculus of variations.

Let me quote Maxwell from his Sept. 1873 Discourse on Molecules, for he said concerning the coarser, atomic–molecular matter (not aether):

.... matter cannot be eternal and self–existent ... It is only when we contemplate, not matter in itself, but the form in which it actually exists, that our mind finds something on which it can lay hold.

....

But that there should be exactly so much matter and no more in every molecule of hydrogen is a fact of a very different order. We have here a particular distribution of matter—a collocation—to use the expression of Dr. Chalmers, of things which we have no difficulty in imagining to have been arranged otherwise.

===

collocation, n.

placing together or side by side.

===

The form and dimensions of the orbits of the planets, for instance, are not determined by any law of nature, but depend upon a particular collocation of matter. The same is the case with respect to the size of the earth, from which the standard of what is called the metrical system has been derived.

<http://www.sonnetsoftware.com/bio/maxbio.pdf>

"Natural causes, as we know, are at work, which tend to modify, if they do not at length destroy, all the arrangements and dimensions of the earth and the whole solar system."

~~both quotes are of James Clerk Maxwell (Discourse on Molecules, Sept. 1873)

Incidentally, the second quote shows that just by considering the second law, Maxwell unknowingly had accounted for the subsequent discovery of decaying or unstable isotopes, though he also said that "the molecule is incapable of ... decay."

Consider an example. Tritium is a naturally occurring radioactive isotope of the hydrogen atom, and at standard temperature and pressure, it exists as gas molecule, T₂, which decays with a half–life of more than 12 years.

Considering all these things, the origins of unstable isotopes also lie in the Creation works of the Supreme Beings, even the Almighty Eloheim. Whatever the Lord God originally organized out of the aether, some of the created atoms and molecules naturally decay (I believe this is mathematically describable by the action principle), due to interactions

Re: Richard Dawkins

Re: Richard Dawkins

with cosmic rays, etc., into other atoms, such as the natural decay of tritium into helium-3. Tritium itself naturally originates from atmospheric nitrogen gas naturally bombarded by cosmic rays, specifically from nitrogen interaction with high-energy neutron. And, tritiated water, T₂O, naturally occurs in minute quantities.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tritium>

The low-energy beta radiation from tritium cannot penetrate human skin, so tritium is only dangerous if inhaled or ingested.

===

If the concentration of ingested tritiated water is sufficiently high. The conclusion is inescapable, that these random processes of natural decay, though they be changes, are not conducive to biological and physical systems, that theistic Evolution is an erroneous notion as much as any other kind of natural Evolution. If there is any 'evolution' of anything at all, it is not by natural means wherein no God or man (i.e., no manufacturer) is involved. As Art Bulla asked, If Evolution is true, why is there death (decay, disorganization)? Unto biological Evolutionists that redefine to suit their a priori demands, something about successfully passing on the genes for natural selection (something to that effect, a set of vague, unproven ideas), I say that there aren't more phenotype possibilities, unless there has been hybridization. I've recently learned that biological Evolutionists consider the fruitful organisms that arise from hybridizations to be 'observed' speciation. Insane, and they claim this is science.

===

Darwinists Squirm Under Spotlight

Interview with Phillip E. Johnson

This article is reprinted from an interview with Citizen Magazine, January 1992.

Phillip Johnson has been a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley for more than 20 years. As an academic lawyer, one of Johnson's specialties is "analyzing the logic of arguments and identifying the assumptions that lie behind those arguments." A few years ago he began to suspect that Darwinism, far from being an objective fact, was little more than a philosophical position dressed up as science—and poor science at that. Wanting to see whether his initial impression was correct, Johnson decided to take a closer look at the arguments, evidence and assumptions underlying contemporary Darwinism. The result of his investigation is Darwin on Trial, a controversial new book that challenges not only Darwinism but the philosophical mindset that sustains it.

....

What was it that initially made you suspect that Darwinism was more philosophy than hard science?

....

Another tip-off was the sharp contrast I noticed between the extremely dogmatic tone that Darwinists use when addressing the general public and the

Re: Richard Dawkins

Re: Richard Dawkins

occasional frank acknowledgments, in scientific circles, of serious problems with the theory. For example, I would read Stephen Jay Gould telling the scientific world that Darwinism was effectively dead as a theory. And then in the popular literature, I would read Gould and other scientific writers saying that Darwinism was fundamentally healthy, and that scientists had the remaining problems well under control. There was a contradiction here, and it looked as though there was an effort to keep the outside world from becoming aware of the serious intellectual difficulties.

<http://www.redicecreations.com/article.php?id=1037>

Journal of Discourses, Vol.1, Pg.116, Brigham Young, February 27, 1853:

The principle of separation, or disorganization, is as much an eternal principle, as much a truth, as that of organization. Both always did and will exist. Can I point out to you the difference in these principles, and show clearly and satisfactorily the benefit, the propriety, and the necessity of acting upon one, any more than the other? I will try in my own way, as briefly as I can. It is plain to me, but can you understand it?

In the first place, matter is eternal. The principle of annihilation, of striking out of existence anything that has existed, or had a being, so as to leave an empty space which that thing occupied, is false, there is no such principle in all the eternities. What does exist? Matter is eternal.

We grow our wheat, our fruit, and our animals. There they are organized, they increase and grow; but, after a while, they decay, dissolve, become disorganized, and return to their mother earth. No matter by what process, these are the revolutions which they undergo; but the elements of the particles of which they were composed, still do, always have, and always will exist, and through this principle of change, we have an eternal increase.

116 And behold, this hath been done on other worlds which have been created by the Power of the Most High and organized from the chaotic element.

Revelations of Jesus Christ 5:116

12 For the foundation of matter, is it not spirit, saith the Lord God?

13 And all things are spiritual in nature, even unto me, saith the Lord God of Enoch and Moses.

Revelations of Jesus Christ 20:12–13

Journal of Discourses, Vol.13, Pgs. 223 – 225, John Taylor, May 6, 1870:

It is vanity, puerility and weakness for men to attempt to gainsay the designs of God, or to boast of their own intelligence. What do they know? Why, they discovered awhile ago that there is such a thing as electricity. Who made that electricity? Did man? Did he originate and place it among the nature's forces? Did it proceed from the acumen of man's intelligence and his expansive mind? No, it always existed, and the man who discovered

Re: Richard Dawkins

it—a little smarter than his fellows—only found out one of the laws of nature that emanated from and originated with God. It is just so with steam—the properties which render it so useful in subserving man's purposes always existed, but man discovered them; if there had been no God to make these properties, no one could have found them out. It is so with the various gases and their properties, with minerals—their attractions and repulsions—they originated with God; man is incompetent to form anything of the kind. So we might go on through all man's boasted achievements; they amount to no more than the discovery of some of the active or latent laws of nature, not comprehended by men generally, but discovered by some who consider themselves, and they no doubt are, smarter than their fellows. Where, then, is the boasted intelligence of man? Science reveals the beauty and harmony of the world material; it unveils to us ten thousand mysteries in the kingdom of nature, and shows that all forms of life through fire and analogous decay are returned again to its bosom. It unfolds to us the mysteries of cloud and rains, dew and frost, growth and decay, and reveals the operation of those silent irresistible forces which give vitality to the world. It reveals to us the more wonderful operations of distant orbs and their relations to the forces of nature. It also reveals another grand principle, that the laws of nature are immutable and unchangeable as are all the works of God. Those principles and powers and forces have undergone no

change since they were first organized, or, if changed, they have returned again to the original elements from which they were derived. ... Yet men will boast that they know things independent of God, whereas unless they had been aided by the Spirit of the Lord, and unless the principles had existed they never could have been found out, for no man could have originated them himself. All that man has ever done, with all his boasted intelligence, has been simply to develop or find out a few of the common principles of nature that always have existed, and always will exist, for these things and every principle of nature are eternal. The Gospel is also eternal. ... If we can understand so

imperfectly the laws of nature with which we are surrounded, with the privileges of seeing, feeling, comparing and analyzing, what do we know of things beyond our vision, hearing, or comprehension? ... History points out what has transpired in relation to the nations of the earth and to men who have lived upon it, but who can penetrate into the future? Man is an immortal being: he is destined to live in time and throughout all eternity. He possesses not only a body, but a soul that will exist while "life or thought or being lasts, or immortality endures." Who can tell in relation to this future? Who can tell things pertaining to our heavenly existence, or the object God had in view for creating this and other worlds, and the destiny of the human family? No man, except God reveals it to him. What has been and still is the position of the world in relation to these things? It has been governed by every kind of dogma and theory of religion. "Isms" of every kind have prevailed in turn—polytheism, infidelity, Christianity in its ten thousand forms, and every kind of theory and dogma that the human imagination could invent. Such contrarities show definitely and positively that men, by wisdom, cannot find out God. And Christianity, at the present time, is no more enlightened than other systems have been. What does the Christian world

Re: Richard Dawkins

know about God? Nothing; ... Oh, fools! What do they know about the truth? No more than a child about its hand. They are imbecile and ignorant and in the dark, and the greatest difficulty in the matter is—they are fools and don't know it.

He lived in the 19th century.
You live in the 21st.

4 ... the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

(Old Testament | Daniel 12:4)

If the cosmic background radiation isn't the high energy radiation of the Big Bang redshifted to microwave frequency, and thus an indication of early conditions that preclude atoms and molecules existing, what do you think it is?

Please present your answer in the form of a scientifically-precise alternative model to the Big Bang's model.

The non-uniformity of the microwave cosmic background radiation intensities detected by the NASA COBE satellite (last year, Smoot and Mather won the Physics Nobel for this work, though not for the right reasons) confirms the position of both Dayton Miller (his empirical conclusion based on his interferometer data) and Maurice Allais (his empirical conclusion based on his paraconical pendulum data) that the aether is anisotropic in nature. But the Big Bang model is a theory of atomic-molecular Evolution, in violation of the second law of thermodynamics.

"Admitting heat to be a form of energy, the second law asserts that it is impossible, by the unaided action of natural processes, to transform any part of the heat of a body into mechanical work, except by allowing heat to pass from that body into another at a lower temperature."
~~James Clerk Maxwell (Theory of Heat, 1871)

"Natural causes, as we know, are at work, which tend to modify, if they do not at length destroy, all the arrangements and dimensions of the earth and the whole solar system."
~~James Clerk Maxwell (Discourse on Molecules, Sept. 1873)

James Clerk Maxwell's unabridged electrodynamics (all 20 equations in quaternion notation, not the 4 equations in vector notation and the corresponding "free space" assumption presented in today's textbooks) posits

Re: Richard Dawkins

Re: Richard Dawkins

the existence of electromagnetic waves that are longitudinal, as well as the familiar transverse EM waves. This has been observed not only by Nikola Tesla but also by more 'acceptable' physicists (though Isaac Newton was the real mad scientist, as well as a homosexual, not the eccentric Nikola Tesla):

"Observation of scalar longitudinal electrodynamic waves", co-authored by C. Monstein and J.P. Wesley and published in Europhysics Letters, 59 (4), pp. 514–520 (2002)

<http://saturn.ethz.ch/papers/monstein/7210.pdf>

That aether is anisotropic in nature and that the coarser, atomic–molecular matter consist of various arrangements of the same have been confirmed to me by shedding of the *Light* of the Holy Ghost, which is the heavenly revelator of the Father and the Son. (I testify that true theology, or the Religion/Gospel of Jesus Christ, circumscribes natural philosophy and any other field of inquiry, indeed all of life itself.)

Journal of Discourses, Vol.2, Pg.184, Brigham Young, February 18, 1855:

"There is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding," and many who do not hold the Priesthood have ideas which are really true, yet they are not always certain whether they are true or not.

isotropy, n.

(Physics) Uniformity of physical properties in all directions in a body; absence of all kinds of polarity; specifically, equal elasticity in all directions.

Mathematically speaking, to say that the aether is isotropic means there is true vacuum, or absolute nothingness, or "free space" as stated in EM sections of physics textbooks. No aether at all. (How do you prove that there is nothing, btw?)

"Science is incompetent to reason upon the creation of matter itself out of nothing. We have reached the utmost limits of our thinking faculties when we have admitted that because matter cannot be eternal and self-existent it must have been created. [360] It is only when we contemplate, not matter in itself, but the form in which it actually exists, that our mind finds something on which it can lay hold. That matter, as such, should have certain fundamental properties,—that it should exist in space and be capable of motion, that its motion should be persistent, and so on,—are truths which may, for anything we know, be of the kind which metaphysicians call necessary. We may use our knowledge of such truths for purposes of deduction, but we have no data for speculating as to their origin."

~~James Clerk Maxwell (Sept. 1873, Discourse on Molecules)

In as much as the dark matter/quantum foam concept is added, the Big Bang theory is somewhat a step in the right direction, but because the model as a whole

Re: Richard Dawkins

Re: Richard Dawkins

violates
the second law and does not apply the complete Maxwell electrodynamics, it
amounts
to useless speculation, not science but false, dogmatic religion. Big Bang
is a type of Evolution theory, one attempt to explain what supposedly
happened before biological Evolution.

"Nature doesn't leave any room to chance and all is determined by cause and
effect relationships. What's called hazard is nothing but a representation
of our ignorance. But the permanent nature of the statistical laws shows the
existence of a hidden order."

~~Maurice Allais, noted physicist and 1988 Nobel Laureate for Economics
Science (About the Aether Concept, 2003)

You've got a degree in physics.
Use it.

John Taylor Gatto (The Underground History of American Education):

Oriental Pedagogy

The ideal of a leveling Oriental pedagogy expressed through government
schooling was promoted by Jacobin orators of the French National Convention
in the early 1790s, the commencement years of our own republic. The notion
of forced schooling was irresistible to French radicals, an enthusiasm whose
foundation had been laid in preceding centuries by utopian writers like
Harrington (Oceania), More (Utopia), Bacon (New Atlantis), Campanella (City
of the Sun), and in other speculative fantasy embracing the fate of
children. Cultivating a collective social organism was considered the
ingredient missing from feudal society, an ingredient which would allow the
West the harmony and stability of the East.

Utopian schooling is never about learning in the traditional sense; it's
about the transformation of human nature. The core of the difference between
Occident and Orient lies in the power relationship between privileged and
ordinary, and in respective outlooks on human nature. In the West, a
metaphorical table is spread by society; the student decides how much to
eat; in the East, the teacher makes that decision. The Chinese character for
school shows a passive child with adult hands pouring knowledge into his
empty head.

To mandate outcomes centrally would be a major step in the destruction of
Western identity. Management by objectives, whatever those objectives might
be, is a technique of corporate subordination, not of education. Like
Alfred's, Charlemagne's awareness of Asia was sharpened in mortal combat.
He was the first secular Western potentate to beat the drum for secular
schooling. It was easy to ignore Plato's gloomy forecast that however
attractive utopia appears in imagination, human nature will not live easily
with the degree of synthetic constraint it requires.

Re: Richard Dawkins

Pink Floyd:

Welcome my son, welcome to the machine.
What did you dream?
It's all right we told you what to dream.

Pink Floyd:

We don't need no education.
We don't need no thought control.
No dark sarcasm in the classroom.
Teachers leave them kids alone.
Hey! Teachers! Leave them kids alone!
All in all it's just another brick in the wall.
All in all you're just another brick in the wall.

.