



Don't miss our new DVD postings on our [YouTube Channel](#) and wow! – another debate so soon - me vs MAD, the Monash Association of Debaters. Monash University is one of Australia's prestige institutions so it should make for an interesting next week on top of devolving cats and new and gloriously failing attempts by the atheists to get life to happen by itself. So welcome to Evidence News 06/12 with Editorial COMment from John Mackay and the Creation Research Team around the globe.

© Creation Research 2012

<http://www.creationresearch.net>

<http://www.askjohnmackay.com>

<http://www.youtube.com/user/askjohnmackay#p/u>

<http://evidencweb.net>

ENews is available in 2 FORMATS – for EMAIL scroll down – for PDF see below index.

INDEX

1. **CHALLENGING EDUCATIONAL LETTER**
2. **NEW QUESTIONS**
3. **GORILLA GENOME SEQUENCED**
4. **LOOSE CABLE MAY EXPLAIN SPEEDY NEUTRINOS**
5. **FOR A GREAT FREE READ**
6. **IS GENESIS LITERAL?**
7. **CARNIVORES LOSE SWEET TASTE**
8. **RIBOSOME STUDY CHALLENGES RNA WORLD**
9. **DVD AVAILABLE**
10. **FROM THE EVIDENCE NEWS ARCHIVE**
11. **DONATIONS**

For ENEWS as PDF [CLICK](#)

For ENEWS as email – just scroll down.

1. CHALLENGING EDUCATIONAL LETTER: *“Wanted to let you know that TN schools received a “D” in science... ‘because of lack of teaching evolution and natural selection.’ Hope you can help turn that “D” into a “F”. Linda*

More details:

<http://m.theatlanticcities.com/technology/2012/02/american-cities-are-failing-miserably-science-education/1138/>

It further goes to this one

<http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/the-state-of-state-science-standards-2012.html>

2. NEW QUESTIONS

EARTH'S AGE? “Where does the age for the earth of around 6,000 years come from?”

[ANSWER](#) by Diane Eager and Daniel Durston.

ADAM'S FAMILY TREE? “Between Adam and me, how many greats go before the word grandfather?”

[ANSWER](#) by Randall Hardy.

3. GORILLA GENOME SEQUENCED according to reports in BBC News, Biology News Net, Nature News and ScienceDaily 7 March 2012. An international group of researchers has sequenced the genome of a western lowland gorilla and compared it with partial genomes of two other western lowland gorillas and one eastern lowland gorilla. They also compared a large number of gorilla genes with those of chimpanzees, orangutans and humans. The research team concluded the human genome differs from the chimp's genome by 1.37 percent, and is 1.75 percent different from the gorilla's genome, and 3.4 percent different from the orangutan. This fits the current evolutionary theory that the humans and chimps have the most recent common ancestor, with the gorilla next, and the orangutan the earliest of the great ape-human splits. However, they found that 15 percent of the human genome is more closely matched to the gorilla than to the chimp.

Aylwyn Scally, who led the study, commented: "Some of our functional biology is more gorilla-like than chimp-like". The team searched more than 11,000 genes in humans, chimpanzees and gorillas for differences in genes that are considered to be important in evolution. Gregory Wray, an evolutionary biologist at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, who was not involved in the study, commented: "It's essential to have all of the great ape genomes in order to understand the features of our own genome that make humans unique". David Begun, a paleoanthropologist at the University of Toronto, Canada commented: "It will allow us to begin to identify genetic changes specific to humans since our divergence from chimps".

The researchers also concluded that some genes had undergone rapid evolution in both gorillas and humans. Some of these genes are involved in brain development and hearing. One of these is a gene named *LOXHD1*, which is involved in hearing in humans and had been thought to be involved in the evolution of speech, but, as Scally commented, "we know gorillas don't talk to each other — if they do they're managing to keep it secret."

Links: [BBC](#), [Biology News Net](#), [Nature News](#), [ScienceDaily](#),

ED. COM. Did you notice it? The statement: "The researchers also concluded that some genes had undergone rapid evolution in both gorillas and humans" is really an admission that they are using evolution as the acceptable glasses to view these genes. No evolution was actually observed, but it was blatantly assumed! What was observed was lots of differences they assume came about via genes evolving, as well as some similarities that they assume means we are related. Again, it is an evolutionist assumption.

The reality is that having all the great ape genomes, as well as the human genome, will not tell scientists what make humans unique, or why people speak. Genome studies will help them understand how the human body differs from that of apes, but that is not the reason humans speak and gorillas don't. The genes associated with speech in humans are just the instructions for building the "hardware" that we use to speak, i.e. the brain circuits, nerves and muscles, larynx, ear, etc. Knowing the genetic instructions for the structure and function of these may explain *how* we speak and understand language, but not *why* we speak, or how and where human language first came into being.

The fact that gorillas have some similar genes for hearing and brain function really means they need these for their way of communicating. But human speech is more than just over-evolved gorilla grunts. We speak because we alone are made in the image of God who speaks, and speech language was programmed into the first human beings, as is the inherited built-in ability for all subsequent human beings to acquire whatever language they are exposed to in infancy, or invent their own when they are not. God gave many new languages at the Tower of Babel. Since creation and later, Babel, where God gave many new languages, all changes in language are the result of human creativity to deliberately build on the language they already had. Over the millennia languages have changed, but never by chance random evolution. (Ref. genetics, anthropology, primates)

4. LOOSE CABLE MAY EXPLAIN SPEEDY NEUTRINOS, according to an article in *Science* vol. 335 p1027 2 March 2012, DOI: 10.1126/science.335.6072.1027. In December 2011 physicists at CERN in Switzerland caused a great stir in the scientific community when they published results of experiments indicating neutrinos could travel faster than the speed of light. As part of the process of checking for anomalies, scientists have measured the time taken for light pulses to travel along an 8 km optical fiber

that connects an external GPS receiver to the Gran Sasso laboratory, Italy, where the neutrinos were being detected after being fired from the CERN laboratory in Switzerland.

According to *Science*: “The investigators discovered that the pulses' transit time varied by several tens of nanoseconds depending on how tightly the coaxial fiber cable was plugged into a socket attached to a card inside the experiment's master-clock computer. The card converts the light pulses into electronic signals. Any loose connection was supposed to stop the pulses from being registered, but instead it appears that the card allowed the delayed pulses to get through. So a loose connection during the experiment would have stamped neutrino pulses with arrival times suggesting faster-than-light travel”. Meanwhile, further experiments are being carried out by the CERN team, using two independent timing systems, and in the USA by scientists at Fermilab near Chicago who are sending neutrinos to the MINOS detector in a mine in northern Minnesota.

ED. COM. So if you have had trouble getting your GPS to work, you can stop feeling so bad now. If quantum physicists can't plug in their GPS properly, what hope have the rest of us got? However, the fact that the CERN team and the Fermilab team, as well as some Japanese researchers, are prepared to keep experimenting means there was enough in the original results for them not to write the whole thing off as bad wiring ... just yet. We await their results with interest. See our original report on faster than light neutrinos [here](#). (Ref. physics, engineering, technology)

5. FOR A GREAT FREE READ of Ian Taylor's book *In the Minds of Men* click [here](#).

6. IS GENESIS LITERAL? Great free Audio. Part 1 - [CLICK](#) and Part 2 – [CLICK](#).

7. CARNIVORES LOSE SWEET TASTE according to reports in ScienceDaily 12 March 2012 and ABC News in Science 13 March 2012. In 2005 Scientists at Monell Chemical Senses Centre, Philadelphia, USA, found that cats have a defective gene for the sweet taste receptor. They have now followed up this discovery by studying a number of other mammals to see if they have lost taste receptor genes. They found that the sea lion, fur seal, Pacific Harbor seal, Asian otter, spotted hyena, and banded lingsang also have defective sweet taste genes. They noted that all these animals were also meat eaters.

Mammals with intact sweet taste genes include the aardwolf, Canadian otter, spectacled bear, raccoon, and red wolf. Some of these are exclusive meat eaters, but others have a mixed diet. The researchers also studied taste receptor genes in bottle nosed dolphins and sea lions, both of which swallow their food whole. The researchers found both had non-functional genes for sweet and umami (savory) receptors. The dolphin also has non-functional genes for bitter taste. Gary Beauchamp, a behavioural biologist at Monell, commented: “Sweet taste was thought to be nearly a universal trait in animals. That evolution has independently led to its loss in so many different species was quite unexpected”. He went on to say: “Different animals live in different sensory worlds and this particularly applies to their worlds of food. Our findings provide further evidence that what animals like to eat - and this includes humans - is dependent to a significant degree on their basic taste receptor biology”.

Links: [ABC](#), [ScienceDaily](#)

ED. COM. What you can taste, will certainly affect what you like to eat, but it has nothing to do with evolution. In all the examples found by the Monell researchers, genes had become defective, i.e. genetic information was lost. This is change, but it is not evolution. It is devolution, or degeneration, and it does not explain how the ability to taste different flavours came about in the first place.

These results are exactly what you would expect from the Biblical history of the world, i.e. created perfection followed by degeneration. In the beginning all animals ate plants and had fully functioning taste genes. Following the Fall of Man and Noah's Flood many animals have lost functional genes due to degenerate mutations as their genomes gradually collapse over time. It is interesting to note that the first scavengers are listed in Genesis just prior to the flood (Genesis 7 – “unclean” creatures) but the first carnivores are not listed till the days of Job (e.g. Job 4:11, 9:26) so it is not surprising that in animals which had by choice become carnivores, the loss of sweet taste has not affected their ability to survive, so any defective taste loss genes have not been eliminated by ‘natural selection’ acting on them. (Ref. diet, genetics, devolution)

See our report on the original study of defunct taste genes in cats [here](#).

8. RIBOSOME STUDY CHALLENGES RNA WORLD according to reports in ScienceDaily and PLoS ONE 2012; 7 (3): e32776 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0032776, 12 March 2012. Evolutionary biologists have long faced a “chicken and egg” problem of which biological molecules came first: proteins or nucleic acids (the NA in DNA and RNA). Both of these are highly complex molecules, and in living cells one cannot work without the other. In living cells proteins are made by a complicated molecular machine named a ribosome, which consists of numerous proteins and RNA molecules. But RNA and DNA also require many proteins in their construction – hence the evolutionist’s dilemma when it comes to the origin of life: what came first, proteins or RNA.

In 1986 some biochemists proposed a theory that RNA molecules were the first to evolve and since then a hypothetical “RNA world” has been built up. Now Gustavo Caetano-Anollés, of University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and colleagues have made a close study of the proteins and RNA molecules in ribosomes and concluded the RNA world could not exist. According to Caetano-Anollés “That world of nucleic acids could not have existed if not tethered to proteins”. The research team described the ribosome as a “ribonucleoprotein machine” and “you can’t get RNA to perform the molecular function of protein synthesis that is necessary for the cell by itself”.

The researchers suggest ribosomes came about by RNA and proteins co-evolving from a less complex combination of RNA and proteins. Caetano-Anollés explained: “If the evolutionary build-up of ribosomal proteins and RNA and the interactions between them occurred gradually, step-by-step, the origin of the ribosome cannot be the product of an RNA world. Instead, it must be the product of a ribonucleoprotein world, an ancient world that resembles our own. It appears the basic building blocks of the machinery of the cell have always been the same from the beginning of life to the present: evolving and interacting proteins and RNA molecules”.

Link: [ScienceDaily](#)

ED. COM. These researchers are correct in their conclusion that nucleic acids can only work in association with already existing proteins, and that is because nucleic acids and proteins are part of a self replicating system, that can copy itself, but not make itself from a zero starting point. All of which points to a beginning as a fully functioning created system.

As we have discussed this problem many times over the years let us again recommend our course for secular highschoools, then reiterate the only solution to this dilemma that works. To understand what it takes to explain the origin of life and learn how to recognise a creation, see the Creation Research course *The Search for the Origin of Life* [here](#).

Now for more detail: In the real world proteins are only useful when their component amino acids are put together in the correct sequence. There are many kinds of RNA and likewise these are only useful if their component molecules are put together in the correct sequence. The information for the correct sequence of both proteins and RNA is ultimately stored on DNA, which acts as an archive of information in the cell nucleus. However, that information cannot be put to use unless is it copied onto RNA – a process that requires many specific proteins. The question that has never been answered by biochemists who study proteins and nucleic acids is: Where did the information come from? It is probably not from the chemistry of the proteins, or the RNA or the DNA. Just as a computer disc contains information but doesn’t invent it, likewise these molecules contain information, but they don’t and can’t invent it. Information has been imposed on DNA by an outside Creator who used the properties of DNA to store information, and who used the properties of RNA and proteins to copy information and apply it.

Furthermore, DNA, RNA and proteins can only function in the controlled environment within a cell. They do not survive for long in the environment outside a protective cell membrane which means biochemists can store and use these molecules outside a cell only if they take stringent precautions to protect them from degrading, by providing an environment similar to that inside a cell. So how could such molecules function before the first cell came about?

Evidence News 06/12 – 21st March 2012

The idea that proteins and nucleic acids evolved by chance random processes in some kind of molecular soup does not fit any known observations of how these molecules are made and how they function. All known observations however do fit the belief they were created to work together inside fully formed cells, along with the myriads of other molecules needed to keep living cells functioning, in an already created cell-friendly environment on a pre-designed life-friendly planet. (Ref. abiogenesis, biochemistry, organelles)

9. DVD AVAILABLE USA, CANADA AND AUSTRALIA AND NOW ALSO AVAILABLE IN UK AND NEW ZEALAND "The Amazing Design of Life". Dr Ed Neeland, Professor of Synthetic Chemistry at University of BC, was interviewed by John Mackay on the creation of life. Dr Ed does a wonderful job demolishing evolutionists' arguments and showing how only the Creator Christ could make life in the brilliant manner it needs to be able to work. Suitable for high school and above, this DVD is hot off the press. We'd encourage you to make use of it and share it with students and teachers. Ed's professional background in synthesizing molecules and trying to make organic things work, gives him a marvellous perspective on just how clever you have to be to make "life". Time: 30 min. [CLICK](#) to preview or click [USA Order](#) or [Canada Order](#) or [Australia Order](#) or [New Zealand Order](#) or [UK Order](#) to order your copy.

10. FROM THE EVIDENCE NEWS ARCHIVE: [Panda Taste Receptors](#), [Chimp Genome](#), [Ribosomes](#).

11. DONATIONS: Get involved in sharing the cost and the blessings of the research and teaching by becoming part of the worldwide support team today via our secure Web site: [CLICK](#) or send gifts to the following addresses.

Donations in USA/UK are tax deductible. See instructions online.

AUSTRALIA: P.O. Box 260 Capalaba Qld 4157

CANADA: Westney Heights Baptist Church 1201 Ravenscroft Rd Ajax Ont. L1T 4K5

TAX DEDUCTIBLE SUPPORT FOR OUR COLLEAGUES click [HERE](#).

NEW ZEALAND: P.O. Box 40480 Glenfield 0747, Auckland

UK: P.O. Box 1 Ashton under Lyne Lancs. OL6 9WW (Donations in UK payable to Creation Research Trust are tax deductible - a Gift Aid Declaration is required - available from

<http://www.amen.org.uk/cr/trust/>

USA: P.O. Box 281 Hartsville TN 37074 (Donations in USA are tax deductible. Make checks to Creation Education Society)

IF YOU no longer wish to receive our updates please reply with REMOVE EN in the subject. To assist us please include your name as well as e-mail address (and organisation name, if any)

www.askjohnmackay.com

www.evidenceweb.net

www.creationresearch.net