

Creation News Update

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

Vol. 19, #3 - Summer 2022 (#78)

PRICE: Free
VALUE: Eternal

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

Hello@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

New Theory of Evolution

Evolutionists always present an unwavering belief that Darwinian evolution is fact, plain and simple. But like that married couple that publicly presents themselves as happy and joyous in their marriage, but fight like cats and dogs in private, evolutionists are becoming more and more dissatisfied with Darwinian evolution.

Some have simply abandoned evolution completely. Others want a new theory but have no idea what that theory



See **Evo** on page 2

RNA World

Life is thought to have come into existence in one of two ways known as **metabolism first** and **RNA World**. Metabolism first supporters think that a metabolic process started from nothing and eventually became cell walls and functioning life and then RNA/DNA started to control things. I haven't seen an article on metabolism first in several years. This is not surprising. Metabolism has to be controlled. The theory has no control mechanism.




That leaves RNA World. RNA World is the idea that life started with RNA. RNA can self-duplicate. That is, it can make copies of itself. DNA,

See **RNA** on page 3

Miller-Urey Experiment

In 1953 Miller and Urey published a paper on an experiment they performed that created amino acids, the building blocks of proteins. It used simulated natural conditions that we now know never existed. They got four amino acids (bacteria and humans need 20) but had to drain them off immediately after they formed or the very environment they were in would quickly turn them into worthless tar. Those amino acids composed a whopping 3.742% of the compounds generated by the experiment. The other 96.258% of the compounds created immediately destroy amino acids. This experiment can still be found in biology textbooks, with some books even admitting the experiment was a failure. Why? Because in 70 years all additional attempts have done even worse. Science proves life had to be created.



Do Science and Religion Work Together?

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. See **Religion** on page 4

Evo from page 1

would be. There is nothing in the middle between creation and the current theory. Some have decided that the data supports intelligent design which generally means they have accepted a creator god. The leader of atheists in the 1990s, Antony Flew, became a believer in intelligent design. He stated it is because the data points to a creator, not natural processes.


But all of this is swept out of sight to the general public because there is a narrative to maintain, that all scientists believe evolution is a fact. Science journalist Stephen Buranyi got many evolutionists to talk about their belief and published an article in *The Guardian* newspaper.

The headline was: "Do we need a new theory of evolution?" The evolutionists he interviewed all said yes. The main complaint cited by the evolutionists is that evolution theory and papers always start at the middle of the story.

For example, they assume that a cell suddenly becomes sensitive to light. They ignore the fact that detecting light involves a complex series of chemical reactions. Until the entire system is in place there is no detection of light. Above-right is the most popular evolutionist illustration of the eye coming into existence. And, they think this happened over 60 separate times in the past.

Notice also that there is a nerve in place to transmit a signal to the brain. That has to be in place at exactly the same time the cell starts detecting light. 60+ times. Then a hollow area has to develop so the eyeball can form. 60+ times. So, not only does the cell have to become sensitive to light, it also has to put a signal on a nerve when light is detected.

The explanations always leave out the part that is even more difficult. How does the brain know what a signal from a light-sensitive cell means? This is a communication system. There has to be information which is encoded into a message that is sent, and is then decoded, *and interpreted*, by the receiver. 60+ times. How do 256 million such cells send a signal and the brain know how (or



even that is should be) assembled into an image we see?

Also, if this happened 60+ times in the first 40 million years of multi-cell life, why don't we find creatures with no eye evolving eyes today. After all, we are told that evolution is always occurring. For every one time something new is successfully created by evolution, there are a million dead ends. Not a single biologist has ever published that a creature is developing something new. We should see nerves to nowhere, organs starting to develop. Wings starting to develop. *Something!* Scientists find nothing new. Nothing partial.

The article goes on as evolutionists cite wings, the placenta, sexual reproduction and other problems of sudden appearance of very complex structures that has to happen all at once. For example, for 100 years, researchers have mutated medflies. Sometimes they get an extra set of wings. See photo at upper-right. The fly **cannot** survive in the wild. Those new wings have no muscles


attached. No nerve to where the muscles need to be. Even if all the parts were there, the brain would have no idea the wings exist and so they still wouldn't work.



The article points out that there is natural selection. We agree there is natural selection. We have pointed out before, natural selection, the gaining of a survival-enhancing mutation is always the loss of information and/or function. For example, a polar bear is aided by the loss of the ability to produce brown hair. The white fur helps the polar bear remain unseen until very close to prey. But it isn't that the polar bear mutated to create some new gene. The gene for brown hair mutated and the gene stopped working. **EVERY** new characteristic produced by natural selection that has been investigated - which are many - has found that information/function has been stopped

I highly recommend you read the article in *The Guardian*. It is somewhat lengthy for a newspaper article, but extremely informative. There is a link on our website home page.

God, in the person of Christ Jesus, is the creator of the universe, you and me. When creation had to be cursed because man's sin invoked God's holiness, God introduced decay into the creation. It is a gift. Decay kills our human body so we can be resurrected into a new sinless body. Not only is He lovingly powerful, He wants a personal relationship with YOU so you can spend eternity in His presence in what we humans can only call blissful paradise. Email us. We can show you the way to **ETERNAL** paradise with your Creator, Jesus! CRM



Worship Services:
Saturday at 6:00 PM
Sunday at 10:00 AM

THE GATHERING PLACE

**Coffee
Community
Conversation**



*A peaceful place to converse
over coffee or do your
internet work-from-home with
a little human contact*

FREE: Coffee, Tea & High Speed Internet

Where: 1835 State Route 89A (Unit 5)
(just east of Picazzo's)

Hours: Tues. to Fri. Noon to 3:00 PM

All Organic

For more information:
 thegpsedona.com
 thegpsedona.com
www.thegpsedona.com

RNA from page 1

which controls cell activity as we know it, cannot self-duplicate. RNA is required for DNA to replicate. In fact, RNA is required for DNA to control anything. Many a research project has been done to create self-replicating RNA. All such projects result in big headlines and big claims only to show nothing really much happened. One such report has recently been released.

We have a link on our home web page to an article describing the paper and claims. Here is the claim:

“According to a new concept by LMU chemists led by Thomas Carell, it was a novel molecular species composed out of RNA and peptides that set in motion the evolution of life into more complex forms.”

Do not worry about understanding the below, just recognize the amazingly design that is going into this experiment.

1 They assumed that huge quantities of RNA existed on the earth. In reality, RNA does not come into existence anywhere except as manufactured in living cells. RNA does not occur in non-living chemical environments.

Then they attempted to show how that non-existent RNA evolved into the machinery we see in cells today.

2 They manufactured a “donor” RNA with a non-standard nucleotide that attached to an amino acid. We will grant that amino acids can occur in nature, but they are quickly destroyed by the very environment required to make them

3 They manufactured a second RNA, an “acceptor” RNA, also with an attached amino acid. They specifically manufactured the two RNAs so they could work together (are you seeing intelligent design here?).

4 They mixed the two RNAs together and heated the mixture to 90 degrees. They slowly cooled the mixture so the RNAs could interact as required.

5 A special compound was manufactured and introduced that would help the RNAs bind together during the next step.

6 They then reheated the mixture to 60-90 degrees at different time intervals so the now-linked RNAs could separate - the linked RNAs from the donor strand.

7 They repeated the above to grow peptide strands (short chains of amino acids - chains of amino acids fold up to make proteins).

The researchers proclaimed that they had demonstrated how RNA World would allow the making of proteins, the basic structural components of cells. Furthermore that RNA could encode genetic information and the building of longer and longer peptides.

Here is reality. What they did was show that what they accomplished can only be accomplished by a knowledgeable intelligent creator.

1 The experiment required 100% pure concentrated chemicals. That simply does not happen in the real world. There are always extra chemicals floating around to contaminate any pure solution.

2 Changes in temperature and chemical conditions on the exacting requirements of the experiment do not happen.

3 RNA is not found outside of living organisms. The DNA in a cell has the coding to build the factory needed to make RNA. Which came first, RNA or the factory that manufactures RNA? Neither. RNA is needed to build the proteins that construct the factory that makes RNA!!! At the start it all had to happen at the same time. Now the factory is needed to build more RNA.

4 The peptides created do not do anything. They are strands of useless junk, not building blocks of life.

5 The experiment required billions of both manufactured RNAs to exist in single drop of water. Why? RNA World has to occur in water so the RNA and resulting peptides can float into each other and react. The problem is that water destroys peptide bonds 100 times faster than the bonds occur. In a solution of amino acids in water, about 2%-3% of the amino acids will form a peptide chain of two amino acids. About .1% will form a chain of 3 amino acids. The problem is that as the third amino acid

joins the chain, the bond of the first two amino acids is breaking. No chains of 4 amino acids will form.

Additional experiments have been done where surfaces with scratches in them allow chains of amino acids to form in the scratch that can be up to 40 amino acids. The problem is that amino acid chains must be removed from the scratch in order to fold into a protein. As soon as you remove the amino acids from the scratch they separate because water tears apart the chemical bonds that cause the chaining effect.

In the end, this recent paper joins a long list of papers that claim results that are not supported by their experiment.

James Tour, a leading origin-of-life researcher with over 630 research publications and over 120 patents states: ... From a synthetic chemical perspective, neither I nor any of my colleagues can fathom a prebiotic molecular route to construction of a complex system. We cannot even figure out the prebiotic routes to the basic building blocks of life: carbohydrates, nucleic acids, lipids, and proteins. Chemists are collectively bewildered. Hence I say that no chemist understands pre-biotic synthesis of the requisite building blocks, let alone assembly into a complex system.

That’s how clueless we are. I have asked all my colleagues—National Academy members, Nobel Prize winners—I sit with them in offices. Nobody understands this. So if your professors say it’s all worked out, if your teachers say it’s all worked out, they don’t know what they’re talking about.

A paper published in the secular journal Biology Direct has the title: *The RNA world hypothesis: the worst theory of the early evolution of life (except for all the others)*. That sums it up. RNA World is promoted because it is the *least* impossible. In other words, it is impossible but other theories are even further from possible than RNA World. A true scientist would state what James Tour states above.

God, in the person of Jesus, created RNA, the first living cell, the universe, you and me. CRM

Religion from page 1

flat and the ships would fall off the edge.

There were some maps around that depicted an edge to the earth, but that 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 Galileo's 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, logic and TRUTH.

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 a creationist cannot do "real science." Cre-

ationists founded science.

Hitler was a Christian -NOT

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. In the last few years several books (by atheists and theists) have been published that support my statements above. They point out that Darwinism is the root of the degradation of society we see today. If you are just advanced pond scum and there are no eternal consequences, why not murder, steal and otherwise harm society?

Privately, the two men Hitler admired 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! You are NOT meaningless pond scum, you are an eternal soul. YOU can live forever in complete joy with Jesus. God, in the person of Christ Jesus, is the creator of good, hope, the universe, you and me. Drop by The Gathering Place and discover freedom to love and be loved. CRM

QUOTE:

We don't need no friggin' new synthesis. We didn't even really need the old synthesis.

Influential biochemist Ford Doolittle (has many essays on evolution)

In my view there is no - can be no - single theory of evolution.

Computational biologist Eugene Koonin

POINT:

Why wouldn't a synthesis be a part of science? Indeed, synthesis means theory. What they are saying is that the theory of evolution has failed. It doesn't work. In fact, this is where evolution theory is today. It doesn't work, but being ardent atheists, they have to believe there is some explanation other than creation that has to be fact. But there is no middle position nor the possibility of multiple theories of evolution. Life started naturally or supernaturally. When little was known about evolution, the theorizers could make any claim. We didn't have the ability to test the theory. Starting around 2000, scientists have been able to do a better and better job of actually watching evolution in action. What has been discovered is that evolution moves downhill, causing extinctions, **not** new, novel functions and structures.