

Creation News Update

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

Vol. 21, #1 - Winter 2024 (#83)

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

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!*

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

Postal Customer

Technical references for our articles are at: www.CryingRocks.org

Junk DNA Turns Evolution Theory to Junk

Let's take a brief look at the history of DNA and evolution. Then we will look at where things are today.

DNA was first discovered in 1869 but the chemical composition was not discovered until 1929. DNA was first shown to have a role in inheritance in 1943, but the structure of DNA wasn't to be discovered until 1953. But by then scientists had begun thinking in terms of DNA being a code containing information.

See [Evolution](#) on page 2




Tree of Life

Evolutionists have always talked about the "Tree of Life." Darwin drew a sketch of his proposed tree of life (right). The concept has been a part of the evolution explanation from the beginning. The tree of life applies to two different aspects of creatures. First, and the way it was used from the beginning, is that physical appearance should slowly change as one follows the limbs of the tree. Exactly which creatures go where was based on the appearance of the creatures. Later, when DNA could finally be economically inspected closely (just in the last 20 years),



See [Tree](#) on page 3

Ablogenesis - The Bet



In 1953, the Miller-Urey experiment showed that amino acids, the building blocks of proteins, can form naturally. They assumed conditions of early earth we now know never existed, but, still, it was a major step. That is the closest scientists have ever come to describing the naturalistic origin of life (OOL). James Tour, a highly recognized researcher in nano-machines in living cells, made a bet. You see, Tour has a website and gives talks informing people that a naturalistic OOL is impossible.

The bet was this: He challenged the top 10 researchers to give solutions to just one of five unsolvable problems in OOL research. Three of them were to be the judges. Yes, the leaders in research were to give a solution and *they* would be the judge of whether they succeeded. If he lost, he would take down his website and videos. Tour won the bet. Life only can come from existing life.

Absence of God

What is the opposite of up? What is the opposite of East? We humans love to find opposites. What is the opposite of God? The opposite of God is the absence of God. That may seem like a strange statement at first, but let me give a couple of parallel examples.



See [Evil](#) on page 4

In the early 1900s evolution was starting to lose status because there was no known mechanism for evolution. “Survival of the fittest” did not explain ARRIVAL of the fittest. With the discovery of DNA being involved in inheritance, the idea of mutations modifying the DNA code was considered. Evolution now had a mechanism.

In 1957 J.B.S. Haldane introduced a concept of “cost of evolution.” The concept has had a lot of debate ever since. I am not going to detail the problem, but simply state that the result of the brief, simplified history given above resulted in what is the modern concept of evolution known as: the **Neo-Darwinian Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution**.

The word “neutral” is part of the theory as it is believed that the vast majority of mutations are neutral, that is they have no effect, good or bad. Unused DNA, junk, can mutate away until something useful happens by accident and then the DNA can go active. (Yep, that is really how it supposedly works.) Many evolutionists still claim human DNA is 97% junk because they realize that without junk DNA, evolution has gone extinct.

How could the creationist respond? There was no data to support the notion of junk DNA. It was theory. Scientists had not yet developed the technology necessary to acquire data. As early as the 1970’s researchers had isolated some stretches of DNA that served as the template for creating proteins. DNA that is not code for a protein was **assumed** to be unused junk by the evolutionists. Creationists, and later, intelligent design scientists, saw the rest of DNA as the control mechanism, though we had no idea how it worked. Those ideas could not get funding or published (the first instances of herd mentality and censor culture).

Well, now the data is in. There is extremely little, if any, junk DNA. Let’s see how the data show this. We are not going to go into great detail. You can easily search for any of this information on the internet. The data I present will be accurate, though, of course, evolutionists will try to wiggle around

the obvious when analyzing the data. I am using, mostly directly quoting, <https://evolutionnews.org/2023/11/peer-reviewed-paper-reviews-ten-anomalies-that-contradict-the-junk-dna-paradigm/>. Note that the information is from peer-reviewed secular sources.

1 The “C-value paradox” is an observation that some types of organisms have unexpectedly high amounts of DNA. It was expected that a creature’s “complexity” or place on an evolutionary ladder would be reflected by the size of its genome. It turns out, there is little correlation. Some “simple” life have a huge genome. Some interpreted this as evidence that much of their genomes were junk, but others suspected that what it really showed is that genomes are more than just protein-coding DNA, and this non-protein-coding DNA could be there for a reason. (This was the first step in thinking about junk DNA.)

2 In the late 1960s, it was discovered that “animal and plant genomes harbour large and variable numbers of repetitive sequences” — often called transposable elements (TEs). These too were viewed as just a type of genetic garbage that accumulated over long periods of time. It’s now known that TEs are vital parts of gene regulatory circuits, although “they are still commonly and erroneously invoked as indices of neutral evolution.” An article in *Scientific American* observes that this view that repetitive DNA is junk has actually held back our knowledge of their functions. These TEs serve as hot spots for genetic recombination and providing new and important signals for regulating gene expression.

3 Another unexpected discovery was that protein-coding sections of genes, called exons, are often broken up by non-coding sections called “introns.” It’s now widely known that RNAs produced by introns are vital for splicing exons together to form different variants of proteins. They thus have a major impact upon what mRNAs are translated at the ribosome.

4 Another crucial discovery is that much non-protein-coding DNA encodes enhancers which serve as transcription factor binding sites (necessary for transcribing protein-coding sections of DNA into

mRNA) and also express long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs). Mattick notes, “There are hundreds of thousands of enhancers in the human genome.”

5 John Mattick (a highly respected secular researcher of DNA) cites transvection as another failure of the junk DNA paradigm, because under this process a noncoding regulatory element for a particular allele (a variation of a gene) can influence regulatory elements of other alleles, possibly via the production of lncRNAs.

6 Epigenetic (non-DNA) processes are often controlled by RNAs produced by non-protein-coding DNA elements. Mattick notes that “transcriptional and post-transcriptional gene silencing” involves the production of small RNAs which can influence epigenetic tagging of gene (e.g., methylation) to turn genes “off.”

7 Another important process is “paramutation,” or “transgenerational epigenetic inheritance,” which is often driven by non-protein-coding RNAs. Mattick notes that this is closely associated with short tandem repeats (STRs), a type of repetitive non-protein-coding DNA element whose length can affect many important biological processes including “circadian rhythms, sociosexual interactions, intelligence, hormone sensitivity, cognition, personality, addiction, neuronal differentiation, brain development, and behavioural evolution.”

Secular researchers have discovered the importance of so-called junk DNA. It is NOT junk. But even the most knowledgeable do not talk about how the lack of junk DNA has falsified the modern theory of evolution.

God, in the person of Christ Jesus created the mechanism for life. It is information based and complex beyond human comprehension. Randomness tears apart the amazingly designed control systems in DNA, resulting in our bodies dying. Amazingly, the incredible designer cares about lowly you and me. All the design is for us. We can experience His loving care and design for eternity if we just call upon the name of Jesus to forgive us for our sin against the designer. Jesus, the creator of amazing grace. **CRM**

Would you like to discuss or ask questions about creation science with the author of this newsletter?

The author, Guy, is at The Gathering Place almost every Tuesday from 12:00 to 3:00 PM. Call (928) 554-4753 if you want to make sure he is there.



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 Picasso's)
Hours: Tues. to Fri. Noon to 3:00 PM
All Organic

For more information:
[thegpsedona.com](https://www.facebook.com/thegpsedona.com)
[thegpsedona.com](https://www.instagram.com/thegpsedona.com)
www.thegpsedona.com

Tree from page 1

it was expected that a tree of life could be put together based on mutations in genes. This makes sense. Appearance is subjective. Gene differences is the more precise and scientifically objective method.



dealing with a true family tree. *It is not what you would expect if a designer had surveyed the whole animal kingdom and picked and chosen — or “borrowed” — the best proteins for the job, wherever in the animal kingdom they might be found.* [Emphasis added.]

Dawkins has many times made the claim in talks or writings that what we find with comparative DNA is a nearly perfect tree of life as evolution predicts.

Meanwhile, in January 2009, *New Scientist* featured an article called, “Why Darwin was wrong about the tree of life.” So which is it? Evolution or ID.

A lot of gene sequencing has and is being done. What does the data show? Dawkins is flat out wrong. On our website home page I have linked a video of a talk given by Dr. Richard Buggs at Queen Mary University in London, England. He is a supporter of the idea of intelligent design. Watch the video found at the web link called Darwin Test on our home page, you will find that Dr. Buggs cites many research projects that support the conclusion that Dawkins is wrong.


After Dr. Buggs quotes Dawkins, he states, **“Many of you who work, like me, with sequence data every day, probably winced a little bit when you heard me read that out because, you know, it is actually not the case.”**

Why then not just drop Darwinism across the sciences. Simple, science is where cancel culture first started. When a researcher finds the data doesn't support the hypothesis of evolution, you run the data through a statistical modeling program and find the tree that is closest to a fit with Dawkins' statement, no matter how badly the mark is missed. Let me illustrate why what you end up with is

nonsense.

What is the probability of a cow jumping over the Grand Canyon. A statistician could waste valuable time doing the calculation. Because of the way statistics is done, there is a chance, an extremely small probability, that a cow can jump over the Grand Canyon. But if the calculation is made using the laws of inertia and gravity, there is zero chance of a cow jumping over the Grand Canyon.

During his talk, Dr. Buggs cites a paper that contains this graph:



It shows the relationship of several different genes for seven trees. Blue lines show the closest relationship followed by red, green and dark green for the farthest. If evolution were true, there should be one simple set of blue lines. Dawkins defined the test. Intelligent design fulfills the test, evolution fails the test. What the statistical probability Dawkins will admit who the winner is? You know...

God, in the person of Christ Jesus, is the Creator of the universe, you, me and the design of life. Stop letting atheists deceive you. Life is designed and their own scientific tests prove it. Do you choose eternity with deceivers, away from the presence of a perfect, loving God? **CRM**

Richard Dawkins defined (quite well) the test to see if life is evolved or designed. He wrote:

Comparative DNA (or protein) evidence can be used to decide — on the evolutionary assumption — which pairs of animals are closer cousins than which others. What turns this into extremely powerful evidence for evolution is that you can construct a tree of genetic resemblances separately for each gene in turn. And the important result is that every gene delivers approximately the same tree of life. Once again, this is exactly what you would expect if you were

Evil from page 1

What is the opposite of hot? Did you say cold? That is what comes to mind first. But, cold is not the opposite of hot. Cold is the absence of hot. You can make things hotter and hotter. The only way to make something colder is to remove heat. Once you remove all the heat, it cannot get any colder. But, theoretically, there is no limit to how hot you can make something.

How about the opposite of light? Most of us would think it is dark. But again, dark is actually the absence of light. You cannot add more darkness to darkness. You can only remove light to make something darker. Once you remove all the light, it can get no darker. But, you can make more and more light.

What would you first think of as an opposite to God? The devil? The devil is no comparison to God in any respect. The devil is inadequate to be the opposite of God.

How about evil? Is that the opposite of God? It makes sense. God is love. The opposite of love must be evil. No. Evil is the absence of love which is equal to the absence of God. God is the source of all love. He has shown us how incredibly amazing His love is by sacrificing Himself in the person of Jesus for us. The only person ever born who never sinned was condemned for us and redeemed us, that is to say that He paid the cost of our deliverance from the penalty of our sin.

How about hell? Hell is, by definition, the absence of God. Hell is therefore synonymous with evil. Hell will be an evil place. Zero good.

Love requires liberty, so God does not require us to love Him back. Each of us has the option of turning away from God. But He is faithful to continue to love us.

Right now every person alive is living under what is known as **common grace**. Common grace is why cultures throughout the world recognize that one should not lie, steal, murder or commit other crimes against their fellow humans. You can hate God with all your might, but He will watch over you with His common grace, keeping civilization civilized for our sake.

God's people, with our Judeo-Christian ethic, and those who are not believers in God but live according to the Judeo-Christian ethic, have provided the stability required by any advanced society. God demonstrates His love by requiring the rule of law. His laws are the basis of societal stability.

Tragically, we see civilization falling apart. One only need look at major cities on both coasts. The citizens have asked God to leave. He has (partially) granted their request. The day is coming when those who obey God will be banished and what we see today will be a pleasant memory. Theft is common place and murder has become normal. Hard to

think it will get worse, but it will... Very quickly as the voice of God is stifled. Again, His love requires our liberty to hate Him should we choose.

Once we die, our decision to love or reject God is cemented. He agrees to our desire. In the end, our desire comes down to this: We either have said, "Thy will be done," or "I want my will to be done." Because of perfect love and liberty, God agrees to our final desire.

For those who reject God, this life is as good as it gets. After death, those who have rejected God finally get their desire. All grace, including common grace, will be withdrawn at your request. The old saying, *be careful what you ask for* suddenly becomes wise counsel applied too late to be of use. Your gift for graduating from this life is that you get exactly what you asked for.

For those who desire God's will, we bask in the perfect personal love of God. A look back at this life will be like a look back at a sampling of hell... But only a diluted sample. Hell will be a total lack of the rule of law. "Good" will be non-existent. Evil will be the master. Yikes!

God, in the person of Jesus, is the creator of the universe, you, me and every good thing. In His absence is a lack of good, 100% evil. Come to Jesus, your only assured hope of spending eternity in love, peace, contentedness... Pure bliss. AMEN! Come Jesus! **CRM**

QUOTE:

Biology faces a grave threat from 'progressive' politics that are changing the way our work is done, delimiting areas of biology that are taboo and will not be funded by the government or published in scientific journals, stipulating what words biologists must avoid in their writing, and decreeing how biology is taught to students and communicated to other scientists and the public through the technical and popular press. We wrote this article not to argue that biology is dead, but to show how ideology is poisoning it... Unless there is a change in the Zeitgeist [spirit of the times], and unless scientists finally find the courage to speak up against the toxic effects of ideology on their field, in a few decades science will be very different from what it is now. Indeed, it's doubtful that we'd recognize it as science at all.

Coyne J.A., Maroja, L.S., The Ideological Subversion of Biology, *Skeptical Inquirer* 47(4), July/August 2023

POINT:

What Coyne and Maroja is describing is true. When science is not allowed to speak scientific reality, but must bow to the opinions of people who are mentally ill, and/or powerful, science is no longer a search for truth, it is a form of propaganda and political control. COVID gives the clearest example. This sad situation is now known as **cancel culture**. What Coyne does not recognize is that cancel culture was actually first practiced by him. Once upon a time, a scientist could have some strange idea that went against the common thinking and that scientist could get his/her research published. It has always been the out of the mainstream "nut jobs" that fundamentally changed scientific consensus. Coyne was among the first to banish those who disagreed with him. Now cancel culture is after him.