

Creation News Update

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

PRICE: Free
VALUE: Eternal

Vol. 10, #3 - Summer 2013 (#42)

But Jesus answered, "I tell you, if these (his followers) become silent, the stones will cry out!" Luke 19:40

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.

Hello! The latest science is full of new findings that show that God, in the person of 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

info@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. Your prayers are especially appreciated. *Thanks!*

Postal Customer

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

The Nature of Science

Most folks do not have an understanding of how science is done. In this article we will explain the process in simple terms. Surprisingly, there is great debate about the definition of science. Frankly, we are not concerned with the definition, but we have a link on our web site home page to some definitions. We are concerned with the **purpose** of science. There may be some disagreement

See [Science](#) on page 2



The Nature of Evolution as Science

In the above article we referred to evolution as covering a range from firm science to no science. One must look at what is meant by evolution. It can mean the history of the universe from the first moment in time to the present and everything that happened in between. Or it can refer to small changes in species as they adapt to new environments, sometimes creating new species in the process. The term



See [Evo](#) on page 3

Science News to Learn By...

4 Books

If you want to know the latest in research regarding the origin of life and evolution, there are four books that sum it up perfectly. Stephen Myers wrote *Signature in the Cell* several years ago. It shows why the design of life by an intelligent agent is the only scientific explanation for life. The atheists

attacked the book viciously, mostly whining that he didn't talk about evolution. Therefore Meyer just released *Darwin's Doubt* which explains concisely why scientific papers by scientists show that data falsifies evolution (and many secular scientists are starting to admit as much). *The Edge of Evolution* by Michael Behe and *Genetic Entropy and the*

See [News](#) on page 3

Mutations: Are they Good Enough?

Recently, Angelina Jolie announced she was having a double mastectomy. She is approaching the age (about 40) where a mutation she knows she has will give her breast cancer. Her female relatives have all gotten the cancer. A mid-twenties beauty queen announced she was about to undergo the same procedure because cancer strikes by age 30 in her family. The background of this article is an image of my genetic test for heart blockages. After quadruple bypass surgery in March, my doctor ordered the test because my lifestyle and genetic history made it clear that my blockages were genetic (5 heart mutations). There are over 20,000 mutations known to harm humans. Exceptional scientific claims require exceptional evidence. When will evolutionists demonstrate that a mutation is a good thing for humans or any multi-celled creature?

Has the Church Fought Science?

There are many myths regarding the relationship of the church and science. Let's start with the most amusing: A Flat Earth.

Flat Earth

Like me, you may have learned in elementary school that Columbus was out to prove the earth is round, not flat.

The kings and queens supposedly rejected Columbus' proposed voyage because the church supposedly taught that the earth is flat and the ships would fall off the edge.

There were some maps around that depicted an edge to the earth, but that

See [Church](#) on page 4

Science from page 1

about the precise wording, but, basically, it is to **describe how reality works**. We are interested in science about the wide-scale workings, not singular miracles and such. Naturalists and creationists agree that reality functions via the laws of nature, or physical laws. In describing how reality works, science also devises means of predicting what will happen in any given set of circumstances in the future. The laws, and many theories, of science are **predictive**... They tell us what will happen in a given set of circumstances. For example, if NASA launches a new satellite, the orbit can be predicted accurately in advance using the law of gravity.

Because the laws of science are **predictive**, they can be falsified. If we were to find that one of the planets suddenly makes a 90° turn and falls into the sun (assuming it has not be struck by another object or energy source), the law of gravity is falsified. There is an interesting sidelight to this. Every time we test the law of gravity and it works, we can have more confidence it is true, but we can never know for sure that it is true. 100 years ago, it was firmly established that the universe is eternal and unchanging. All the data we gathered confirmed it. But then, observations were made, due to advancement in telescopes, that showed the universe is expanding. It couldn't possibly be eternal or unchanging. In a moment, what was thought to be scientifically true, turned out to be false. That is why many scientists have stated that science is not about proving things, it is about falsifying things. Falsifying things gets us closer to truth because a possibility can be eliminated, but we can never know for sure that something is absolutely true.

So far, we see that science deals with the present and the future. But, mankind is not satisfied with that, we want to know about our origins. What happened in the past? When we look back into the past, we are looking at data that was created long ago. We interpret that data in the present. Interpretation is **explanatory**. To be **predictive**, there must be a way to do repeatable, measurable experiments so we have a continuing build-up of confidence in what we know. But, the past and origins

is a one-time event that was not observed. Interpretations can be falsified, but what is being falsified is an interpretation. It is an attempt to explain what happened with no possibility of experimental confirmation. The best we can do is come up with a better explanation (interpretation).

What we do in science today is often called **operational** science. Interpreting what happened in the past is often referred to as **historical** science. (With the advent of CSI programs on TV, it is now often called **forensic** science.) **Operational** science is **predictive**, **forensic** science is **explanatory**.

Hard, Firm, Soft

Science is generally thought of as hard or soft, but we think there is also an in-between description, we call firm.

Hard Science: Hard Science is scientific endeavors that follow the scientific method rigorously. There are two hard sciences: Physics and Chemistry. In these two sciences, experiments are repeated, ideas can be falsified and predictions can be made. Every advancement in technology is the result of physics and chemistry.

Firm Science: Biology is perhaps the firmest science as there is a lot of chemistry involved. Observations can be repeated, even if they may not be repeatable experiments as such. For example, we know the Krebs Cycle, which generates energy in all oxygen using living cells. The Krebs Cycle is a series of chemical reactions, so technically it is chemistry. It has been repeatedly observed in living cells, so it is solid science.

Other firm sciences are geology, astronomy, cosmology... most of the other things we call science. There is a lot of physics in Geology. For example, from physics we know why a fairly small flooding stream can move huge boulders. But we won't know exactly what the conditions were that buried a boulder in the Coconino Sandstone. Nobody was there to observe and we cannot create an experiment to make that determination. We try to explain what happened, but when we do, we leave the realm of operational science and enter the arena of interpretation. Everything we are told about the history of the earth is speculation.

That speculation used to be subject to revision at every point. 100 years ago, it was a fundamental axiom of geology that all geological activity of the past HAD to be explained in terms of slow and gradual processes. In 1923 Harlen Bretz proposed that the eastern scab lands of Washington state were created in one massive flood due to the removal of an ice dam during the melting of the ice age. It took several decades for geologists to agree in numbers large enough to make it the now-accepted interpretation. The difference between then and now is that those who disagree with modern geological philosophy cannot get published. It is assumed they are wrong and they never get to make their case. Brentz was allowed to repeatedly make his case. It changed geology from slow and gradual to neocatastrophic as more and more geological features were shown to have been formed rapidly rather than slowly.

NASA scientists can say there was a world-wide flood on Mars (there is good evidence), but we can't find the water. The earth is 71% covered in water and has the same appearances as many supposedly water-created features as Mars, but a world-wide flood is not allowed as a possibility because it means the Bible might be true.

Soft Science: These are primarily the social sciences such as psychology. Repeated experiments usually give different results each time. About the best that can be done is to identify trends.

Evolution spans firm and soft sciences. We have repeatedly observed artificial selection (such as breeding dogs with different appearances and behaviors) and adaptation where a species enters a new environment and adapts to that environment. But we have never observed a change such as a dinosaur becoming a bird, nor do we have a single piece of data from the fossil record of such an occurrence. In kindness, we will call it soft science, but to call it science at all is a stretch. Our next article explains this classification further.

God, in the person of Jesus, is the creator of all natural laws, the universe, you and me. CRM

Evo continued from p. 1 has been so elusive that it is now simply defined as “change.” For this article we will look at two aspects of evolution of life. Though I don’t particularly like the terms I use below, they are an accurate way to differentiate the two aspects of evolution we are going to discuss.

Micro Evolution: This includes natural selection, adaptation and artificial selection. First of all, there is no such thing as natural selection. “Selection” is something that is done by an intelligent agent. In addition, natural selection is based on the idea of survival of the fittest. That has been debunked by observation. Observations that secular scientists have reported show it is really survival of the lucky.

When a mountain lion gets hungry, which deer will he eat? The next one. There is an exception. If the deer does not run from the lion, the lion will not eat the deer unless he has become extremely hungry. Creatures of prey expect their dinner to try to escape. If the mountain lion goes after a young deer, it doesn’t matter how fit the deer is, it will be eaten as it has no chance of escape as an adult might have. The lion may eat the most fit young deer. If the deer is trapped in a box canyon, the lion will easily win regardless of the fitness of the deer. It truly is survival of the lucky.

Adaptation does occur. Brown bears migrated northward into polar regions and changed, or evolved, into polar bears. The process of adaptation results in a LOSS of genetic information and

future adaptability. Those worried about the warming earth may have reasonable cause to fear for the future of polar bears. They no longer have the ability to adapt to warmer climates. Yet, polar bears are not an emerging new creature. They are simply a sub-group of brown bears. Polar and brown bears mate and produce offspring, so genetically they aren’t that much different. It is just that the polar bear has lost some genetic information.

Artificial selection has been performed by animal breeders for centuries. Ask any farmer and he will tell you that you cannot breed for new characteristics. You breed OUT the bad characteristics from critters that already exhibit the characteristics you want.

Macro Evolution: This is the idea of dinosaurs becoming birds. Darwin admitted that a lack of transitional fossils between kinds of creatures was a serious problem. He stated exactly how to falsify his theory (every good theory should supply a test for falsification). He said that in the future, paleontologists must find many “missing links.” There are now FEWER supposedly missing links than here were in Darwin’s day. As we discover more fossils, we find more and more kinds of creatures, but no missing links.

The fossil record was the main (and currently only) argument for evolution. But that record has been found to work against evolution. Where we should find small changes leading to a new kind, we find new kinds suddenly appearing and then small changes occurring as the critters adapt to new environments. Exactly

the opposite of what evolution “predicts.”

It was predicted by evolutionists that the new field of genetics would prove evolution. In the past 10 years we have obtained large quantities of DNA data the evolutionists find that the opposite of evolution is in the data.

Common descent through modification is the mantra of evolution. What this means is that there was a first cell and all life is the result of modification of the that cell through time. If that is true, then we should be able to look at the genetic code, specifically genes, and see the relationship of all creatures and build a nice, accurate “Tree of Life.” The opposite has happened. For every gene, you get a different tree of life and the differences are huge. This falsifies common descent through modification.

What you hear from the evolutionists PR is that there are no problems with evolution and everything being discovered fits perfectly. But in the science journals, it is a different story. The problems are so obvious that papers are now readily published that point out the huge problems. *Nature*, in 2000, noted that “Evolutionary trees constructed by studying biological molecules often don’t resemble those drawn up by morphology.” This is a polite, politically correct, way of stating that all those trees of life drawn based on critter appearance are wrong based on DNA studies.

God, in the person of Jesus, is the creator of the different kinds of critters, the universe, you and me. CRM

News from page 1

Mystery of the Human Genome by John Sanford illustrate in two different ways why evolution cannot be true. We highly recommend these four books if you want a full understanding of what research of the past 15 years has yielded regarding the origin of life and evolution.

Dinosaur DNA

At the 2012 Western Pacific Geophysics Meeting in Singapore they forgot that real science is sometimes unacceptable at science conferences. A group of non-USA scientists presented data from their

research showing the C-14 content of dinosaur bones give ages of the bones of 22,000 to 39,000 years old. When the leaders of the conference realized they had let this data into the conference, they removed the presentation from their web site. All C-14 in dinosaur bones should be gone in about 80,000 years. These ages are in line with other tests of C-14 in dinosaur bones that have been done in the past. But, you can’t let real data interfere with hating God and His creative acts.

Titan Methane

While you will read from NASA and the

general media that methane on Saturn’s moon named Titan may contain life (a ridiculous thought as a few simple carbon-based molecules will not make life without information and preexisting life), you won’t read that the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (which sent the space probe Cassini to Titan 7 years ago) is reporting to scientists that the methane is running out. In fact, NASA researchers in the past and present have reported that Titan’s methane would be blown into space from solar wind in less than 10 million years. Saturn and its moons have to be less than 10 million years old. The data fits 6000 years. CRM

Church from page 1

was artistic license. The Greeks established that the world is a sphere and even calculated the diameter to an amazingly accurate degree. What Columbus was searching for was a shortcut to India. Europe was doing a lot of trade with India and it was a long way around Africa to get there. Much money could be saved by sailing west directly to India. The big concern was not falling off the edge of the earth. The big concern was taking enough fresh water on the voyage. Columbus knew it was a long way to India and the ships could not carry enough water. He was hoping to encounter islands along the way where he could replenish his water supply. He hit an island in the Caribbean and named the area the West Indies, thinking he was near India.

The real hoot is that there now is a flat earth organization that says the members believe in a flat earth. The leader has also said they also believe in evolution. So, the next time you hear an evolutionist refer to a creationist as a flat earther, you can point out that flat earthers are actually evolutionists, not creationists.

Galileo

The supposed persecution of Galileo by the church is an atheist favorite. For what appears to be a rather impartial story of Galileo, I refer you to the anti-church, anti-Christianity and especially anti-creationist web site called wikipedia. Though his arguments regarding the earth circling the sun played a role in his life-

time house arrest (with continued financial support from the church), it was a minor factor. The fact is that the pope was a big supporter of his and he publicly insulted the pope regarding non-science issues. As we have seen in the news lately, insulting or embarrassing a leader results in some form of banishment, even today. In addition, it was Aristotle who had proclaimed that the sun orbited the earth. In Galileo's day, you didn't contradict Aristotle, so his major problem was like the problems creationists have today. You don't contradict the reigning paradigm in science without consequences. It was not long after that when the church began building universities. The church has long had high regard for education, learning and logic.

The Founders of Science

I have had atheists claim that science started because "free thinkers" wanted to break the bonds of the church. They obviously have not done any research, they just hate God and His people. Isaac Newton thought he would be best known for his writing on the Biblical books of Daniel and Revelation and did more writing on those books than he did on science and math.


Johann Kepler stated, concerning his research, that he was merely thinking God's thoughts after Him.

You will find similar quotes by just about every founding father of a science.

One thing refuted by these facts (quotes) is the atheists' claim that

Men's Breakfast at 8:00 AM
 August 31, Sept. 28, Oct. 26 and the
 Last Saturday of most months

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!



a creationist cannot do "real science." Creationists founded science.

Hitler was a Christian

There is one "free thinker" in Sedona who occasionally likes to point out that Hitler was a Christian. I have challenged him to do some research instead of just reading atheist propaganda web sites, but he simply responds with some comment Hitler made about being a Christian. I refer all "free thinkers," once again, to Wikipedia. Even they state that Hitler was anti-church, definitely not a Christian, but used the church as best he could to meet his objectives. His public, pro-Christianity statements reflected only what he saw he needed to do to gain power. Privately, the two men he admired the most were the pope because he had so much power, and Darwin because Darwin gave him the excuse he needed to slaughter those he considered to be the "less fit."

Come on, join us free-thinking Christians. Not only will you enjoy the thinking and conversation, you will find joy today and for eternity! CRM

QUOTE:

This most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent Being. ... This Being governs all things, not as the soul of the world, but as Lord over all; and on account of his dominion he is wont to be called "Lord God" παντοκράτωρ [pantokratōr], or "Universal Ruler". ... The Supreme God is a Being eternal, infinite, absolutely perfect."

Principia, Book III; cited in; Newton's Philosophy of Nature: Selections from his writings, p. 42, ed. H.S. Thayer, Hafner Library of Classics, NY, 1953 (Newton wrote this while investigating the movement of the planets)

POINT:

Newton is considered the greatest scientist who ever lived by many philosophers of science. He was a Bible-believing creationist, not someone seeking to be released from the bondage of religion as atheists like to proclaim. The problem with atheist "free thinkers" is that if they think it, then it must be true. Reality is ignored. The second greatest father in science is James Maxwell, who provided the mathematics showing that magnetism and electricity are related. He wrote: *Almighty God, Who hast created man in Thine own image... teach us to study the works of Thy hands...that we may believe on Him Whom Thou hast sent, to give us the knowledge of salvation and the remission of our sins. All of which we ask in the name of the same Jesus Christ, our Lord.* Science exists because of creationists.