

Darwinism & Other Crumbling Theories in Science

Editorial by N.E.Myridis (nmyridis@auth.gr)

In this editorial, I decided to publish a review of mine regarding the scientific book *Entropy and Information Optics - Connecting Information and Time*, Yu F.T.S. The review is given in the following text.

The scope of the book at hand is the mutual presentation of Information and Entropy through the prism of Optics; in other words, the transaction of Information and Information Processing Systems by the inherent characterizing identity of Entropy and by specific means of information processing, i.e. Optics. It is of course a resampling or re-exposition of scientific knowledge regarding the field of information and entropy, as well as optics. The aforementioned knowledge has already been exposed and written in essays, in excess.

Another crucial fact, which should be given special attention and definitely characterizes the work at hand, is the repetitive multiple author's reference to 'Mother Nature'. The belief in the existence of 'Mother Nature' instead of God is obviously paganistic. However, paganism is the worst kind of blasphemy against God.

Moreover, there are unfortunately outdated references in this book (e.g. reference [3], p.176; the first edition of this reference is mentioned whilst there are five newer editions, the last one in 1999). The latter inconsistency is due to the fact that two editions of the book at hand preceded (the first one in 1976). There are also several so outdated references (remaining without updates since the first edition of this essay). Which could be consequently the reason of such an outdated third edition, while serious scientific progress has been made in relative fields?

However, we should mention that there are several points of this work where author's perception is correct. For instance, he repeats the known self-evident fact that we cannot create something from nothing and without cost (of energy).

Although the author has a rich background regarding the areas under examination and he can shape critical opinion on these areas from the materialistic point of view, however this is not truth for the transcendental cases (e.g. interpretations regarding Genesis). Eventually, we observe that the author accesses transcendental cases.

Another crucial technique used in this work, which one is repeated many times throughout this book, relates to bibliographical references. The author does insist on referring to his distinct papers along this essay, however in a permuted way/order. That is, he does not put selected papers of his own to the right place, i.e., in the right chapter of the book. Instead, he usually cites those papers not in the homonym chapters but in a previous or a next one. Why? Finally, the author repetitively uses the term 'myth' to characterize several critical fields such as for instance *science*, *information*, etc. However, he does not reason why there are myths of *science*, *information*, etc. Moreover, he arbitrary interchanges -without any other explanation- the usage of the term 'myth' between individual aspects (e.g. chapter 16 -'Information in Myth of Science' in comparison to his paper 'Science and the Myth of Information'! (cited in the next chapter (17)!)).

Consequently, this work (collection of topics) should be restructured/rearranged based at least on the previous observations; moreover, a redirection of this work is necessary. Such a redirection could be achieved by removing (a) those parts of text where arbitrary statements are written regarding subjects of metaphysics or the Creation and (b) furthermore, by removing relevant personal (arbitrary) 'bridges' of the author. Furthermore, the sophistry of citing subjective beliefs as valid, is not scientifically correct.

Finally, regarding the plethora of topics presented in this collection of papers, we should note that it could be characterized as satisfactory as well as the intermediate correlations between several sub-fields of interest. However, the individual chapters constituting the overall project seem to some extent not fully interrelated and connected.

In conclusion, we should mention that there are many-many other crumbling theories (myths) which are provided as 'scientific'. The most fake and illogical among them is the known 'theory of evolution' or 'Darwinism' which should be renamed as "hypothesis" or even "myth of evolution", in order not to be confused as a valid mathematical theory. This fake hypothesis was built on counterfeits such as for instance that of 'the Pilttdown man'; the latter is one of the major counterfeits in 20th century.

N.E.Myridis

Chief-Editor

Ass. Professor of Informatics

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece