

Hartford Courant



THE HARTFORD COURANT ♦ A11

Tuesday, January 2, 2001 ♦

Science Does Support Creationism

RONALD J. PARISE

In December 1999, Kansas state legislators voted to remove the theory of evolution from the state science curriculum. This is historic because Kansas was the first state to officially adopt evolution in public schools after the famous Scopes trial of 1925.

U.S. Rep. John B. Larson of the 1st District has eloquently called for a high technology park in East Hartford to make Connecticut a hub of scientific research and development. As part of this leadership role in science and research, now is the time to start teaching in Connecticut schools the sound scientific facts that point to human origin based on creationism.

The theory of creation, in fact, has more support from the fundamental laws of physics than does evolution, in particular the second law of thermodynamics.

Many recent articles hailing the 75th anniversary of the landmark Scopes trial maintain that science supports evolution. The question is, What science? Science grounded in rigorous mathematical proofs based on observations and physical evidence? Or science based on theories proposed by people who observe scattered bone fragments and fossils that give unclear, uncertain and often ambiguous indications?

The scientific evidence employed to support evolution comes from archaeological digs and carbon dating to estimate age. Over the past several years, the estimated age of the Earth has gone from 5 billion to 8 billion years. With more recent findings, anthropologists could not justify the evolution of man from geological digs unless the Earth is much older — or could it be that man did not evolve from apes?

Anthropologists are "research scientists" who normally come from a nontechnical background such as history or less stringent technical curriculums in the natural sciences (biology or chemistry). Therefore, the "scientists" who provide proof of evolution do not have the mathematical background or under-

standing to apply the Second law to biological systems.

The second law, based on observation of natural systems and sound mathematical logic and proof, provides support for creation, or at least challenges evolution. This is the same law that says it is impossible to make a perpetual motion machine, or that heat cannot flow from a cold body to a warmer body without some type of external stimulus. These are phenomena we may not understand, but they are nonetheless familiar to us.

The second law simply states that all systems, natural or manmade, go from an orderly existence to one that is chaotic. Attempting to restore order at one locale results in more chaos elsewhere, and the chaos must always outweigh the order. This supports the Big Bang theory — a universe that is going from a compact, orderly system to one that is exploding and expanding with reckless abandon.

All systems (mechanical and biological) age over time, wear out, become less functional and eventually fail or die. That is, they fall apart in chaos or disarray, following the second law.

The second law suggests that simple systems do not gravitate toward more complex, well-organized, sophisticated systems. Yet evolution requires that single cells in random existence joined together to produce a complex hierarchy of cell structures that became sophisticated, orderly biological organs in fish and dinosaurs and human beings.

Evolution requires that this organization and hierarchy of sophistication are the result of heating by the sun. Yet the only known observable effect of heat on a natural system is more chaos.

These are contradictions that point away from the evolution theory. They violate and contradict the second law unless an outside source or stimuli is present to effect this change. In fact, to create a higher degree of complexity and organization, there must be an outside stimulus. And for such complex systems as body organs, elephants and dolphins, this stimulus would have to be more complicated and intricate than just the addition of heat or a spark from an electrical

storm. Therefore, the second law may now support the theory of creationism.

In the past few years, mathematicians, research engineers and physicists have been looking at the second law of thermodynamics. They are starting to develop theories that better match the possibility that evolution does not fit the fundamental laws of nature and that other possibilities do exist — such as creationism.

Now even state legislatures that once demanded only the teaching of evolution are starting to realize the possibility that creationism is not a religious issue but may be based on scientific fact. Alabama and other states may follow suit with Kansas.

The true science of mathematical equations and observation of phenomena point strongly away from evolution to a more reasonable Creator who needed to influence and tweak these biological systems into the complex, orderly systems we know today.

Ronald J. Parise, an inventor in Suffield, has a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering.