

Creation News Update

Proclaiming the TRUTH of the Bible starting at Genesis 1:1

PRICE: Free
VALUE: Eternal

Vol. 7, #3 - Summer 2010 (#30)

We must speak for silence would shame us, and the rocks themselves would cry out... You, O Lord Christ Jesus, must be praised for who You are in the world You have made.

Nobody is Condemned to Hell(?)

C. S. Lewis is famous for his book, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* which is a simple explanation of how Christ died for our sins. His other books about the land of Narnia are also popular. Many folks are unaware that Lewis is considered a great apologist (one who presents arguments in favor of a position) for Christianity. He wrote many books about the Christian life and relationship with God. In *The Great Divorce*, Lewis finds himself on a bus traveling from Hell to Heaven. The riders all get off the bus at the edge of heaven. See Lewis on page 4

Hello! The latest science is full of new findings that show Jesus is Creator of the universe, you and us. Thank you for joining us in learning the Good News.



Guy & Cindy Forsythe

You will find technical references for our articles at:

<http://www.CryingRocks.org>

Published Quarterly in Sedona, AZ by:

CRYING ROCKS
Ministry

PO Box 2526
Sedona, AZ 86339

928-282-2433

News@CryingRocks.org

If you would like to further the cause of our Lord Christ Jesus by supporting Crying Rocks Ministry, we invite you to send a donation of any size. Please send check or money order, not cash. All donations are tax-deductible, will be acknowledged, and a year end statement will be sent after the first of each year. *Thanks!*

Postal Customer

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SEDONA, AZ
PERMIT NO. 201
CAR-RT-SORT



Photo by Wilson Bentley

From Order to Emergence - Part 2

The first thing we must do this issue is clarify a bit. A **materialist** is one who believes there is nothing more than matter and energy. There is no god, no supernatural. All that is has come about via laws of nature only. A **naturalist** is a **materialist** talking about science. For all intent, the words are interchangeable. We are sorry for any confusion resulting from using these words interchangeably. See Order on page 2

The Semmelweis Reflex

According to wikipedia, The Semmelweis reflex or “Semmelweis effect” is a metaphor for the reflex-like rejection of new knowledge because it contradicts entrenched norms, beliefs or paradigms.

You’ll see why the reflex is so bad for science. But, I first need to say that we are all guilty of exhibiting the Semmel-



See Reflex on page 3

What is the purpose of SETI - one leader explains

On the *Lateline* program on ABC (Australia) television in 1996, the presenter interviewed one of the astronomers behind the SETI program. Why would anyone bother to send signals into space, hoping to get an answer, when the closest planet (if any exist) is likely to be a hundred thousand light years away? It would take 200,000 years to get an answer! What would motivate anyone to do this? What motivated this astronomer? He said, ‘It would be the death of religion.’ ‘You mean Christianity?’ asked the presenter. ‘Yes,’ was the reply.

(The idea that all scientists just follow the facts is a myth.)

Science News to Learn By...

Synthetic Genome?

The J. Craig Venter Institute made headlines by decoding the human genome before the “official” government-funded group did. Now they have claimed to have created the first synthetic genome. Venter likes headlines and the media was thrilled

to help him out by simply repeating his claim. *New Scientist* even called it the “Immaculate Creation.”

Let’s see what really was done. The scientists started with preexisting DNA from a preexisting cell. They then added some DNA to the preexisting DNA to See News on page 4

Order from page 1

A quick *review* of the previous article starting with definitions:

Order: Logical or comprehensible arrangement of separate elements

Organized: methodical and efficient in arrangement or function **OR** formed into a structured or coherent whole

UnOrganized: not having or belonging to a structured whole

DisOrganized: lacking order or methodical arrangement or function

Things are placed in an order by organizing them. There are three basic ways to organize. We fully explained these terms in the previous article. You can re-read it by downloading a PDF of the newsletter from our web site. The first two require an intelligent agent because the result is a methodological arrangement or function. A simple way to think of it is this: Choices were made from more than one possibility. Only intelligence can make choices from a list of possibilities. The third is the result of deterministic natural law. Law means no choice. If there was choice in natural law, there would be no laws because there would be no consistency in results. Science could not be done without laws being deterministic... Lacking in choice.

Complexity

I have read several articles on-line and just finished two books on complexity science. Yes, complexity is now considered a science. I have to give it to them that there is a lot of science revolving around complexity and a lot of science involves complexity. But, here is some foreshadowing, complexity is nothing more than a description, not an action. On the other hand, studying the complexity of something is certainly a scientific endeavor, so I think it is appropriate to have “complexity science,” and have scientists who study complexity.

Interestingly, scientists are struggling to come up with a definition of complexity science. Most refuse to even try to give a concise definition. I think the reason is

because they are diving into extremely complex situations without first setting some foundational work. Now, I agree that diving into complex analysis is a lot more fun and interesting than being a worker bee establishing a foundation. I don't blame them. But we will take a stab at building some foundation.

The closest thing to a definition I came across is this by Neil Johnson in his book, *Simply Complexity: the study of the phenomena which emerges from a collection of interacting objects*. There is that *emergence* word again (see previous article). Complexity becomes some sort of force instead of a description. Johnson does do a great service in stating that complexity is not the same as complicated. For some (like me) baking a cake would be a complicated adventure. But, I can follow the instructions and get the job done.

Complexity, on the other hand, is more than the sum of the “ingredients.” There is a synergy. If I forget to put salt in my cake, I still get a cake (I think). If I forget to put a spring on a mousetrap, I don't have a mousetrap. I have a bunch of parts. You can probably see why it is hard to define complexity. The line between complicated and complex can be fuzzy at best. You can talk about it and get an understanding, but a concise definition is difficult. That is why most of what I have read on complexity consists of descriptions of investigations into complexity rather than defining the term.

Complexity Definition

Please note that I am not pretending that I have come up with the enduring, all-wise definition of complexity. I haven't. But it is time to start trying some attempts. This is mine. *Complexity is the result of two or more orders working together to produce something entirely different from any of the orders taken independently. An order consists of one or more units of something.* This is a pretty inclusive definition. Table salt would qualify. Sodium (Na) and Chlorine (Cl) are both deadly poisons. Combine them chemically into salt (NaCl) and you have something totally new... Something we must have or we die. I don't like the idea that something

so “simple” qualifies as complex in my definition. It kinda takes away all the intrigue, doesn't it? I think that is why it has been so hard to define complexity. Any definition is going to let in things we think of as simple. But, as I read through the explanations given by the scientists, table salt fits.

Irreducible Complexity

It is time to open a can of worms. Irreducible complexity is one of the battlefields in the worldview war between creationists and naturalists. Table salt is irreducibly complex. If you remove either chemical, you end up with two chemical poisons. You no longer have anything that is anything like table salt. Hopefully you can see why I would contend, that if we stick to trying to get to the root definitions, we would have to say that “irreducible complexity” is redundant. In other words, every complexity is irreducible. The item most discussed regarding irreducible complexity is the mousetrap. We have to greatly simplify here so we have links to the full arguments on our home page.

Michael Behe first introduced this *M*argument. If you remove any part of a mousetrap, it no longer functions. The question becomes, how could a mousetrap “evolve” if everything about the mousetrap must be in place (and working together in a complex way) or you have nothing. This was part of an argument about natural selection being able to construct new structures in life.

The naturalists' response is that you could remove the base and fasten the rest of the parts to a floor and still have a mousetrap. There were other arguments, but because the naturalists did take time to study what Behe said, most arguments were actually against *specified* complexity, not *irreducible* complexity.

This gets tricky and shows why more thinking is needed with my statement that all complexity is irreducible. The key here is the intent of the designer of the mousetrap. Mousetraps are designed to be portable so you can take the trap to the mouse and not put holes in your floor. The new mousetrap of using the

See *Order* on page 3

Reflex from page 1

weis reflex.

The story starts in 1846. Dr. Semmelweis started his new job at the Vienna hospital's Obstetrical Clinic. The clinic was part of a doctor training hospital. A second clinic at the hospital trained midwives. Death from childbed fever (puerperal fever) was 10%. In the midwives clinic the death rate was less at 4%. By April of 1847 the total death rate for the clinic was an alarming 18%. Dr. Semmelweis was aghast. He started looking for the reason.

After eliminating all other possibilities, Dr. Semmelweis concluded that it must be because tiny particles from cadavers were being transported by doctors into the obstetrical clinic. He ordered that all doctors leaving the morgue had to wash their hands. Within a few months the death rate dropped to 1%.

Word spread of Dr. Semmelweis' discovery. You probably think this is the happy story where his technique was adopted over all of Europe, saving thousands of lives every year. I wish it were. What Dr. Semmelweis experienced was fierce persecution from the medical and science professions. Germs were unknown then and this technique did not meet with the scientific paradigm of the day. He lost his job.

Being a committed doctor, he took a volunteer position in another hospi-

tal. Once again, he was able to drop the death rate dramatically. Six years later, after much delay and opposition, Dr. Semmelweis was given a professorship at the University of Budapest. Now he could teach doctors about hand washing.

Dr. Semmelweis' experiments in hand washing is what is known as empirical evidence. He developed a hypothesis. He ran tests. The tests showed that his hypothesis was correct. Lives were saved. The dramatic evidence was there for everyone to see. His experiment could easily, and at almost no cost, be tried at any hospital in the world.

Instead, he encountered hostility. He was ridiculed for his "belief." It was, after all, entirely unscientific. That is to say that the majority, rather than do a quick scientific study to prove or falsify Dr. Semmelweis' work, instead preferred to increase their hatred toward him for going against the current paradigm. Rather than do science, they just attacked his character.

Frankly, I can see the point of the others. It is tough to spend 30 or 40 years teaching a belief only to find out you were wrong and actually permitted the death of thousands. Indeed, it is human nature to continue to think we are right even when proved wrong.

In the end, Dr. Semmelweis became more frustrated at the rejection of the

obvious and became a bit eccentric. OK, a lot eccentric. He was tricked into entering an asylum where he was beaten, restrained and "treated" for mental illness. He died just a few days after entering the asylum... He died of the disease he had eliminated in two hospitals. Shortly after his death, the practice of hand washing was eliminated where he had worked and the death rate once again soared where it had been so low during his tenure.

Climategate has shown us that the same thing happens today. Those scientists whose research led to the conclusion that man has little to nothing to do with global warming were ostracized, called "deniers" so they would be associated with those who deny the slaughter of six million Jews in WW2. The "deniers" were denied funding, couldn't get published, lost teaching jobs. One lesson: Science + politics kills science.

This leads to the quote by Professor Doolittle on the back page. Why does he say the best weapon for fighting creation science is ridicule? Very simple. The weapon of last resort when empirical studies do not support the current paradigm, is to attack the person instead of the science. It is Dr. Doolittle and other God haters who are the deniers of the obvious as exhibited by scientific research... God, in the person of Jesus, is creator of the universe, you and me. CRM

Order from page 2

floor as the base has taken away the intent of the design. The result is that we have, at least partially, eliminated the full complexity of the mousetrap and made a new complexity. One could argue it is a poorly designed complexity. It is not easily moved from place to place, it leaves holes in your beautiful floor, and does not work unless the floor is made of a substance similar to wood in ability to hold a fastener. It won't work on carpet. It appears the critic is an unintelligent designer, to use their own description of such a situation as this.

But, some situations are far more subtle. An automobile is a very complex machine. If the sound system is removed, is the complexity destroyed

and replaced by a new complexity? This is the stickiest type of point I have come across in trying to nail down complexity. One could make the argument that the mousetrap change is no different than this example. I will take the next step and state that complex designs may include *optional orders* (such as a sound system or the type of base as in the mousetrap).

The reason for this next step is the fact that there is an intelligent designer that made choices. If the design specifications state that a sound system is intrinsic to the design, then we have destroyed the complexity and made a new one. If the designer's attempt is to get you from one place to another, removing the sound system has not changed the complexity. Younger readers won't remember a time

when a sound system (in those days a radio with tinny-sounding speakers) was an option that cost extra. Now it is included. Now you can get a better sound system for more money so we have simply moved to a different set of options. I am going to be like one of those complexity scientists and leave this open for your own thoughts.

Most of the examples given in the books are about situations where there is human design and/or choice. Very little time is spent on natural phenomenon. We will get back to this problem in a future issue. But, first we have to complete our definitions of complexity. In the next installment, we will talk about the hot button of complexity: Specified Complexity. CRM

Men's Breakfast Saturday, August 28th at 8:00 AM

And the **LAST** Saturday Morning each month

Come to Way-side Chapel at the north end of uptown for good food and good fellowship. All men are invited. No charge. *See you there!*



Lewis continued from p. 1

They must then make their way to the heart of heaven on foot. Most return to the bus to return to hell.

The most profound and accurate passage in the entire book reads... **There are only two kinds of people in the end: those who say to God, "Thy will be done," and those to whom God says, in the end, "Thy will be done." All that are in Hell choose it. Without that self-choice there could be no hell.**

News from page 1

serve as markers, simply to show they added DNA. It took very sophisticated equipment to add the new short segments of DNA. The real discovery was just how much effect a mutation can have. They report that just a one single mistake in coding set them back three months.

Machines in the Cell

It now known that every cell has tens of thousands of machines under the control of the central processing unit

You may find this a little confusing so we will attempt to explain. This concerns two attributes of God. The first is His **love**. We covered this topic in our Winter 2009 (#24) issue. We will briefly summarize that article.

Love requires liberty. The one who is loved must be free to love or not love in return. If the one who is loved is forced to love back, there is no love at all. Either there is an element of fear or lack of freedom of will, i.e. a lack of liberty. God created us so we could have a loving relationship with Him. It isn't about interpretation of Bible verses, it is all about a personal relationship with God through Jesus, the Christ of God, Creator of the universe, you and me. We discuss differences in interpretation to sharpen our understanding of God.

If you choose to not have that loving relationship with God, you are asking Him to leave you alone. Because He

loves you, He gives you the desire of your heart... **Thy will be done**. You have chosen to be separate from God. That is the definition of Hell.

The second factor is **justice**. We covered this topic in the Fall 2007 (#19) issue. If a wrong is done, we humans demand justice. We are made in God's image so it is not surprising that we demand justice because God is the ultimate when it comes to justice. When we reject God's love, we have determined the outcome. We have brought justice upon ourselves, by choice. We have requested to not be bothered with love. Where is the place where no love will be found? Hell. When we understand God's love and justice we see why Lewis was so concise. A God so loving as the God of the Bible must let us have our own way. If we choose Hell, in love, He grants our desire. He sets aside His power and says, **Thy will be done**. CRM

called DNA. It has long been known that cells will let certain chemicals in while keeping others out. Now we know that it is done with pumps. One of those pumps is responsible for pulling potassium into the cell. It is made of a precisely shaped and electrically charged gate that has a latch that rotates like an iris (a diaphragm consisting of thin overlapping plates that can be adjusted to change the diameter of a central opening). It also has switches and pulleys. This intricate machine will pump MILLIONS of potassium ions

through the cell wall every second while blocking all other ions.

Simple Cell

There is no such thing. The machine mentioned above is one of tens of thousands found in a "simple cell." Scientists recently finished analyzing what they have been calling a "simple cell." Tens of thousands of machines, transportation systems and computer control tell of the incredible talent of Jesus, our creator. CRM

QUOTES:

“Flunk the idiots. 40% of the Freshmen class at USCD (University of California, San Diego) reject Darwinism. The university has become alarmed and has offered remedial instruction for those who believe in ID. The USCD should never have admitted them in the first place. Just flunk the lot of them.” Dr. Larry Moran, Professor of Biochemistry - University of Toronto

“The most effective tool to combat intelligent design and creationists is ridicule.” Dr. Russel Doolittle, researcher in the blood clotting mechanism - Professor at UCSD (University of California, San Diego) - This was Dr. Doolittle's response when asked at a seminar put on for students what problems Dr. Behe has in his argument on the irreducible complexity of the blood clotting mechanism. *This educator knows how to teach science!*

THE POINT:

Here we have quotes from scientists studying evolution. Note how they want to handle those who disagree with them regarding evolution. Why don't they present arguments from research to show why they are correct and we creationists are incorrect? We reported the answer a couple of issues back... "Darwinian evolution in the light of genomics", *Nucleic Acids Research, 2009, 37(4), 1011-1034* reported how actual investigation and experiments are showing that evolution did not and cannot occur. The reason that ridicule is the best weapon that can be used against creationists is because it is the **only** weapon available. Facts support creation, and debunk the mythical philosophy of naturalism. Knowledge of information content (3 billion characters) and a computer-like operating system in DNA points to an intelligent creator, not random luck.