



Chronicles of Diversity

Cheesy Cows

8 December 2004; Volume 6, Issue 43

After ruminating on last week's message, I feel I wasn't politically correct in my discussion concerning the cows coming home. I assumed that a cow's evolutionary purpose was to feed me hamburger, and on down the food chain to bacteria in the sewage treatment plant.

In the soon coming millennium, when the lion and the lamb are friends, cows will not be holy, but they will not be slaughtered just for hamburger, they will continue to be the source of heavenly food, namely ice cream and cheese. For me to degrade cows to a Big Mac, or a Whopper, especially without cheese was definitely insensitive on my part.

Now, you may think this opening is a ludicrous statement, and I suppose I would agree. However, this is not any sillier than events we are now witnessing in America. Truthfully, can the end of time be that far away.

Speaking of time, and if we are all here for a purpose as the Bible says, one concept that disturbs my sense of temporal security is the fact that if God created Adam first, he had to be the smartest person ever. Eve, made from Adam, would share that same intelligence. If all that is true, we have been on a downhill path ever since.

The creative intelligence question sets us on a regression curve for the whole continuum of time. The end must come before we are too stupid, to understand the gospel of Jesus Christ and His redemption from our folly. Therefore, it must be a young earth after all.

©2004; non-commercial education & forwarding encouraged, all other rights reserved

Jerry Bannon

Wonder Springs

7950 Seward Park Avenue South

Seattle, Washington USA 98118

phone: 206.660.0697

email: bannon@createleaders.org or chronicles@createleaders.org

Please forward prayer requests to: prayer@createleaders.org

Washington State Charity Number: 7529

Visit our web site at: www.createleaders.org

To subscribe to these free weekly messages please send us an email

Analysis of that regression from wisdom to complete uselessness, demonstrates conclusively that evolution is impossible. Ridiculous things are happening so rapidly in the last few months that the end must be near. The only missing step, from our present absurd happenings unto total chaos, that I can envision is one step into anarchy. Except for the grace of God it shall be so.

It will have to be God's grace alone, that will allow us to continue, maybe until 2006 and beyond. However, key is the interaction, or integration, of the individual with community. There are significantly different ways of looking at how communities are organized and grow, one is the rational man centered development, and the other is God's natural law, common grace development.

First of all, rational growth says you can be all you want to be. God says, I will recreate you into all you can be. Therefore, personality size wise, you can be your own BB, or you can be God's basketball. Any size progressions are determined by the perceived choices you make and your commitment to those choices.

Secondly, rational growth of community structure comes about by association. You are a Republican, Democrat, Jew, terrorist, or a member of any or all the groups you might want to join. Most of the time this includes tangible and/or intangible payment of dues.

Natural law and common grace community growth is on the basis of family, or as evangelicals are fond and error in saying, relationship. Relationships are a neutral term, hence we live in a politically correct neutral world. The problem is that you can have relationships with Democrats and be a Republican. And on the spiritual spectrum, we all have a relationship with both God and the devil, whether we like it or not.

True growth and development within the Biblical context centers around the family of God, not becoming members of a caste. In a family community you have to put up with your stupid brother in law, just 'cause. Over time you may even grow to understand his opinions, and he yours. It's called growth, it's called love, or brotherhood. You can't pay to join a family, being part of a family is a gift of grace.

In a rational community you associate with people you may like or not, because you are only related by a sense of values. To the amount you adopt those community mores, you devalue your own individuality. For you to become a leader in these communities, your personality must become subservient to community values.

Blue county politicians and pundits, from both the left and right are spinning the recent political elections as people voting for their values. As we can see from this analysis, they have the wrong community paradigm. Evangelicals voted for George W. Bush mostly because he is their brother. You might not agree with many of his important issues, but we are all family stuck in this amoral world degenerating without any absolutes. Absolutely as family, you are going to vote for someone who believes in something beyond himself and the organization.

In the great State of Washington, last Friday, Democrats deposited a check with the state to begin a manual recount of the governor's race. The press conference, which was shown on C-Span showed this great rational worldly values community paradigm.

"We are going to count every vote by hand, (even though it is less accurate than machine counts), because we want the State of Washington to have a Democrat governor. If we have a Democrat governor, we will feel secure on the Washington plantation, because she shares our values."

I found it interesting however, that Gary Locke, the current Democrat governor, had been to school from last Wednesday to Friday. Even though he spoke of counting every vote, on Friday he also spoke of the limitations of the electoral process, and the fact that the best we could ever hope for was an accuracy of 99.99%, 99.9% being more likely.

This is in contrast with his statement recorded in the Seattle Times on Wednesday, "What's amazing is that in all the counties, every time there is a count, the tally changes."

He also mentioned correctly, that this difference of the fourth significant figure is really about 300 votes, which could go either way, in contrast with the 1000 votes we discussed last week. Both we will see shortly are way too small when we really look scientifically at the results (and that in part is why I used the 1000 guesstimate last week).

It really gets scary when you look at this election-recount in the mathematics of statistics. First of all, we must assume that these counting practices follow a normal distribution, then we can use statistical tables to determine a degree of accuracy of the data. This is similar to the margin of error reported in the political polling data we have seen and heard for the last few months, and we know how accurate they have been.

We can use statistics either on the number of votes counted, or on the difference number of votes between the candidates. In the statistical sense we can say that we are certain at a specific percentage level, that the true mean (average) of the data lies between these two points. This confidence level comes from a value taken off a "t table" and is reported with certain degrees of freedom for a Student's t-test. (The degrees of freedom is one less than the total number of values we have in our sample. In this case we have two counts, less one, equals one degree of freedom.)

It could, or may be argued, that the new manual recount lies outside the normal sampling criteria established for elections, and should be rejected as invalid, or inaccurate (or both), but that will be determined by any potential litigation, depending upon the results of the manual recount and who wins. See how ridiculous this could get.

Normally, we would like to be 95% confidence in our statistical analysis, however the values in the table are given for confidence intervals up to 99.9%. Properly stated, we should say that we are 95% (99.9%) confident that the true mean of the (election) data lies between these two numbers.

Currently, we are stuck with the results of the two counts we now have. And the confidence t value we have from the table for a 95% two tailed test is 12.7, and for the 99.9% confidence interval is 638. With the third recount and now two degrees of freedom, these numbers would drop to 4.30 and 31.6 respectfully.

Current mean Gregoire votes = 1,371,798 with a positive change of 1289 votes, or the average variation of 645 votes.

Current mean Rossi votes = 1,371,949 with a positive change of 1070 votes with the average variation of 535 votes.

Using these average changes as the statistics for our t-test we find the margin of votes for Gregoire at the 95% confidence interval is 8200 votes around her mean. For Rossi that same interval is 6900 votes above and below his mean counts.

That same interval for Gregoire at 99.9% is 410,000, and for Rossi is 350,000 votes at two significant figures.

Now if we use the numbers for the difference in the election margin, Rossi won the first time by 261, and the second by 42, or the average win was 152 votes. Setting a 95% confidence interval on this difference we find the variation in votes is 1900, and 97,000 at the 99.9% level.

All this goes to show if we count all the votes until, cows are only used for producing cheese and ice cream, holy cow, we will never really know using our best statistical science who actually won this election.

Former Governor Booth Gardner, during the C-Span conference was asked what kind of mandate Gregoire would have if she won this (third and final?) recount. He remarked, "She wouldn't have a mandate, she would have a job to do." That remark should hold true for both candidates.

So tying statistics to elections, to family versus association, to eternal cheese and ice cream, and possible legal proceedings, we are brought back to the truth that using all our best efforts, all we do is "Inherit the Wind."

The choice is, do we become part of the Christian family, or do we associate with the organization of godless reason?

The essence of the "Inherit the Wind" movie and the Scopes trial revolved around the literal interpretation of the seven days of creation in Genesis Chapter 1. Also on trial was the fundamentalist

Christian belief that the creation took place in 4004 BC as calculated by Bishop Usher (Archbishop James Usher of Armagh, Ireland 1581-1656).

There are, of course, many other Judeo-Christian estimates for the date of creation, perhaps the one with the most merit would be the calendar of the Jews themselves. This calendar's date of this article's publication is 25 Kislev 5765.

Now a family argument could ensue as to whether an Irish bishop has a better line to God than the Jewish people. Other discussions concerning anti-Semitism, and to force God's creation into our desire for perfect understanding, could easily be expressed. However, even in our present day, any litigation on these truths, should and would be thrown out of court as ridiculous. We still have a little time left, but who knows what other religious nonsense the next few years will bring. Then again, there really was a "monkey trial" about 80 years ago.

But what does creation say about the age of the earth? I don't mean how does man justify his religious beliefs about the age of the earth. (Using for the most part urban or blue county logic.) But what does the creation itself say using the decomposition of various minerals, that were formed when the earth was created.

There are 69 of these listed in an appendix, in "This is Creation Science" by Henry Morris. Now Dr. Morris is a creation scientist, so a rational evolutionist might say that he made up the numbers. However, if you use natural law and common grace as absolute criteria for truth, their values should be able to be verified by independent analysis.

So doing similar statistics as we did with the election of the Washington governor we find that the average age of the earth is about 32 million years, with a standard deviation of about 100 million years.

The t-test table I used in the governor's election ran up to 30 degrees of freedom, in this analysis we have 69 variables. In statistics a sample of 50 and above is normally considered a large scale sample, that adequately samples the population (of the age of the earth variables). More samples giving us a better idea of the true characteristics of the population.

Now we have to make the assumption that the age of the earth variables follow a normal distribution, which probably isn't completely true, but for the sake of simplicity (and our lack of knowledge) we can assume that these statistics will be more accurate than someone sitting behind a desk using his judgment, or someone in a pub throwing darts.

In any event, using statistics we can assume at the 95% confidence interval, the true age of the earth lies within two standard deviations (actually 1.96) of the reported mean. Setting those intervals around the 32 million year mean age of the earth, we find that the we may not exist yet (zero earth age) or the earth may be as old as 232 million years.

This variation does not make the warm and fuzzies of the fundamentalist feel that good, but the statistics don't say, that within the family argument he is wrong. Variation is a problem we find with using natural data, naturally points are very scattered.

However, this analysis does show that a true evolutionist with a perceived age of the earth of 4.5 billion years, and a universe age of 15 billion years, belongs to a different religious family, and might have to join an evolutionary association to find a sense of community. That community being so far out, that it is at least an order a magnitude beyond any substance, or truth, of reality.

All this goes back to the difference between my definition of science and religion I wrote in my last college philosophy class. "Science is what my dad uses to get me to eat my vegetables, religion is what I use to explain why I don't want to eat them.

Taking this a little farther, everyone likes ice cream and cheese. Whether it is in the family, or in association with others, this is pretty much a universal truth. However, the meaning of the language in either group, while it may sound the same, has very different meanings. We have different flavors of ice cream and different types of cheese.

The ludicrous facts of this time seems to be, is that no one is willing to communicate seriously about the wonders of their ice cream or cheese with the another community paradigm. So let them eat cake.

Whoever eventually becomes governor of the State of Washington will have that job to do if they are going to be effective. Personally at this time, I have my doubts that either candidate is that accomplished.

Therefore, the job of communication falls to just plain folks. Christians also don't have a mandate, but a job to do.

The Bible says when you know the truth, the truth will set you free. In context, only those set free by the redemption found in Christ alone are free to accept other people into the family of God.

The fact that some evangelicals continue to form religious right organizations for the promotion of association, shows conclusively that they have lost touch with God's true community, especially as it relates to those potential adoptions into God's family. All people seek family love, they abhor self-righteous religious bigots of any religion.

The task for God's community is to love people into the family, and warn them that if they continue down the road of Big Macs and Whoppers their health will suffer. Adding cheese doesn't make burgers heavenly food.

The taste of good cheese and ice cream, can give us a common basis for developing more compassionate communities. Just because I enjoy ice cream and cheese doesn't mean I should pig out on them myself, but should share them with my family and those who been created with a purpose they have yet to discover. Hospitality, in every sense is always about family and love. This is the season of cold and natural darkness, that is why the contrast of hospitality is so important. Our ludicrous present, demands nothing less.

Other articles in this Phylogenesis Series:

Liquidity with purpose; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/liquidity9-29-4.pdf>

Bottled Liquidity; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/bottleliquid10-6-4.pdf>

Fakin it; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/fakinit10-13-4.pdf>

Natural Energetics; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/natureenergy10-20-4.pdf>

Political Energetics; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/poleenergy10-27-4.pdf>

Reasoned Phylongeny; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/reasonphylodg11-3-4.pdf>

Sasquatches & Polar Bears; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/sasbears11-10-4.pdf>

51-48 gas; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/51-48gas11-17-4.pdf>

Show me; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/showme11-24-4.pdf>

A cheap plot; PDF link: <http://www.wondersprings.com/2004pdffiles/acheapplot12-1-4.pdf>

