



David Roemer <david@dkroemer.com>

Cosmological Argument

2 messages

David Roemer <david@dkroemer.com>

Sun, Jan 8, 2017 at 1:20 PM

To: Uri Nodelman <editors@plato.stanford.edu>

Cc: "Matthew L. Lamb" <fr.matthew.lamb@avemaria.edu>, "Matthew L. Lamb" <frmatt@mac.com>

Dear Uri,

I'm reading three recently published books on the arguments for God's existence written by Catholic scholars. I found this quote in "Theology Needs Philosophy: Acting Against Reason Is Contrary to the Nature of God," edited by Matthew L. Lamb:

In the above I have not mentioned other readers of Aquinas in our time, such as A. Kenny, P. Geach, N. Kretzmann, and so forth, none of whom were able to cope with Aquinas's doctrine of God as *Ipsium esse subsistens*. (Chapter 3, Lawrence Dewan, O.P.)

As I said in the my letter of December 31, 2016, Aquinas's concept of God is that God is a pure act of existence without a limiting essence. Kenny, et. al., are philosophizing about this concept of God not coping with it. What Kenny was coping with, if he was coping at all, was the possibility he would go to hell. My point is that there is no need to make a decision about God's existence. What we have to decide is whether or not God has communicated to us that there is life after death.

Very truly yours,
David Roemer

David Roemer <david@dkroemer.com>

Sun, Jan 8, 2017 at 3:53 PM

To: Uri Nodelman <editors@plato.stanford.edu>

Cc: Jerry Coyne <j-coyne@uchicago.edu>

Dear Uri,

In my letter of January 7, 2017, I refer to "Argument #1," which is based on an understanding of evolutionary biology. This argument can raise professional difficulties for academics because the science establishment in the U.S. is perpetrating three hoaxes about evolutionary biology with the goal, presumably, of making themselves feel better because they think, like Jean-Paul Sartre, "man is a useless passion."

Hoax # 1

The theory of evolution is that whales descended with modification from bacteria over a period of about 100 million decades. This theory is judged to be true by rational people and gives rise to the question of what the mechanism for evolution is.

The three mechanisms or theories I know about are natural selection (Pierre Louis Maupertuis), natural genetic engineering (James Shapiro), and epigenetics (Jean-Baptiste Lamarck). These mechanisms only explain the adaptation of species to the environment. They do not explain common descent, yet many laymen think they do:

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 is 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 imagine 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. (Christine Kenneally, *The First Word: The Search for the Origins of Language*, 2007, page 59)

Scam # 2

Many people in the U.S. believe human beings evolved from animals. The scientific truth is that *homo sapiens sapiens* evolved from animals. *Homo sapiens sapiens* are hypothetical creatures without free will and the conscious knowledge of human beings. *Homo sapiens sapiens* have only the sense knowledge of animals.

Scam # 3

This scam got its start from pro-religion, not anti-religion, fanatics. (One might say scam #1 got its start from advocates of intelligent design.) The initial scam is that biological evolution violates the second law of thermodynamics (law of entropy), according to which a gas fills up the entire container it is in. The evolution of stars does not violate the second law. Rather, the second law does not apply to the evolution of stars. What makes this an atheistic scam, actually a scandal, is that the *American Journal of Physics* published an absurd article titled "Entropy and evolution." This article is not being retracted, I suppose, because of fear of this hypothetical exchange:

Religious fanatic: Evolution violates the second law of thermodynamics.
American Journal of Physics: The laws of thermodynamics do not apply to biological systems.
Religious fanatic: Does not apply ...violates ...whatever.

"Pseudoscience in the American Journal of Physics" (<http://www.pseudoscience123.com>).

https://www.academia.edu/20939526/An_Analogy_Between_Nazi_Germany_and_the_United_States

There is another matter I want to warn you about. Biological evolution, because of its connection with the arguments for God's existence, causes conflict and anxiety. Anxiety inhibits people from behaving rationally. Jerry Coyne, a fanatical atheist, has a blog titled, "Why Evolution is True," and is a distinguished professor at the U. of Chicago. A college student wrote an article criticizing creationism. Coyne thought the 19-year-old was endorsing creationism and blasted him. I gave a short analysis of evolutionary biology, and Coyne called me a creationist. To his credit, he published my comments in full:

<https://whyevolutionistrue.wordpress.com/2013/11/20/nc-state-student-admits-that-his-antievolution-diatribes-was-a-satire-but-a-real-creationist-appears/>

Very truly yours,
David Roemer