

General Topics :: evolution**evolution - posted by luckyd (), on: 2007/2/8 2:29**

I want to learn more about evolution...where would a good place be to start. Oh and i have a question. the thing about the deep rock layers and then later there were animals and then more earlier there were people..does anyone know about that...i just want an opinion about that showing how that isnt true for evolution

Re: evolution - posted by preacherafla (), on: 2007/2/8 2:44

I think one of the best places for the information you are looking for is found at Answers in Genesis. They have a great website that archives articles and they have many books and DVDs for sale. What is neat is that they have things for all age groups and their goal is to help Christians think and see the world through a Biblical view rather than a world view. Ken Hamm also has a short radio program that covers these topics as well. (He is part of Answers in Genesis). Hope this helps. My whole family enjoys him.
In His service,
Preacheraflame

Re: evolution - posted by MSeaman (), on: 2007/2/8 14:29

I would suggest in addition to Answers in Genesis, Kent Hovind has some excellent resources and you can find them here at sermonindex. Look in the other speakers audio sermons under H and you will find both. Kent Hovind's website has links to a lot of websites about it as well.
Noah's flood explains all the layers. One catastrophic event can cause a lot of damage to the environment. Mt St. Helen is a perfect example to prove it doesn't take millions and millions of years to make layers...

Re: evolution - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/2/8 15:09

Here is the Answers in Genesis website: www.answersingenesis.org. There's a button at the top of the page called Get Answers and that has lots of issues in categories, so it's really easy to find what you're looking for.

God Bless, Jordan

Re: evolution, on: 2007/2/8 15:52

luckyd, here is a website from an online encyclopedia and what it says about human evolution.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiregional_hypothesis

Note that it starts out saying:

"Because of the scarcity of fossils and the discovery of important new finds every few years, researchers disagree about the details and sometimes even basic elements of human evolutionary history." This is true, but it doesn't dissuade scientists from believing in evolution. But then, neither should the overall evidence for the evolution of life dissuade anyone from believing the message of salvation in the Bible.

Bub

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2007/2/8 16:50

Hello...

One of the greatest flaws in the theory of evolution is not just the lack of fossil "evidence" concerning homosapiens, but also in ALL OTHER ANIMALS. Few of the "missing links" (supposedly between man and ape) are generally accepted by all scientists. The fact that there are virtually NO "missing links" for all other animals is puzzling to even the most ardent evolutionists.

Another great flaw, in my opinion, is that carbon dating (the greatest "proof" about the age of fossils) is based upon the half-life of carbon atoms. It is used to measure everything from living trees to meteors. Here lies the flaw: Does the method "date" carbon's half-life in its current appearance, or the atom from the beginning of its creation? And come an outside alternative force (solar radiation, flood water, etc...) effect the deterioration of the half-life of such atoms?

These are interesting things to think about. The entire "science" of evolution is based upon a small group of theories that are universally accepted by most scientists. But if a major flaw is found, it would set such scientists afoot in search of "explanations" for such discrepancies. Unfortunately, there are few respected scientists that are even considering flaws in the theory of evolution or the age of the Earth.

:-)

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/2/8 19:21

Another thing with the fossils is that some many animals are found fossilized together that shouldn't be together according to evolutionists. Like the one small dinosaur found inside a fossilized dog, that one really puzzled the evolutionists. :-D

Jordan

Re: evolution - posted by Meriwether, on: 2007/2/8 23:04

In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood

By Walt Brown, Ph.D.

You may read the entire book on-line or order a copy from the web site. It's written like a text book. Very organized. Check it out. I'd love to hear feedback from anyone else who has read this book.

Re: evolution - posted by jordanamo, on: 2007/2/9 0:05

Want to learn about Evolution? I'd recommend starting with Charles Darwin... Origin of Species. You can find it pretty cheap, used, online at Amazon.com or Abebooks.com... it should be only about \$4-\$5 including shipping.

I wouldn't recommend reading a book/film/etc. by someone that denounces Evolution... to learn about Evolution. You won't get the full picture. It's like an atheist reading anti-biblical books without ever reading the source-- the Bible. :-P

Jordan

Re: evolution - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/2/9 0:22

luckyd,

Our oldest son, who graduated from Mississippi State University for Women, told me you should learn the basic principles of Biology and then when you apply these to the theory of evolution you will be able to discern truth from error. (This son graduate with a BS in microbiology.)

ginnyrose

Re: evolution - posted by preacherafla (), on: 2007/2/9 8:20

There is a new book out by Carl Kerby called "Remote Control" that doesn't teach about evolution but shows how Hollywood paved the way for and helped to indoctrinate viewers to evolutionistic thinking. It's light reading and interesting.

I hope this is not too far off the thread but Ken Ham wrote a book called "Creation Evangelism for the new Millennium." This is a good book showing some ways to evangelize a world that has grown up being taught evolution and being taught that the Bible is not all true.

I apologize if this is too far from the stream of thought we are on.

In His service,
preacheraflame

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/2/9 9:15

Quote:

-----The entire "science" of evolution is based upon a small group of theories that are universally accepted by most scientists.

I think Bubba puts a finer point on this acceptance...

Quote:

-----"Because of the scarcity of fossils and the discovery of important new finds every few years, researchers disagree about the details and sometimes even basic elements of human evolutionary history." This is true, but it doesn't dissuade scientists from believing in evolution

(Emphasis mine)

Let's see if I can relate to this belief. I believe man, over the course of a few million years, evolved from a branch of monkey, whose species was another mutation from a type of lemur that lived millions of years earlier, and so on through shrews, mammal-like reptiles, amphibians, fish, and cellular plasma creatures....all the way back to a miraculous immaculate conception of a living reproductive cell that came to life from a sloshing of minerals, waters and strobing sunlight.

Now, neither myself or any other scientist has successfully explained how this came to be, nor can any of us agree on what exactly is the organizing force in nature that can create fully functional organs, breathing, circulatory, and nervous systems, complete DNA sequencing. In fact even the billions of years we have requisitioned for our belief still does not mathematically support the quantum-fantastic diversity in biology, the astonishing puzzling forms of life manifested, all successfully overcoming an endless series of incomprehensible odds, only to constantly be producing one surprising transmutation after another. Indeed modern genetic and animal husbandry science, a human intelligent design factor that should outwit chance quite considerably, can't even evolve a sheep or a cow into..well another type of animal that isn't a sheep or cow.

Still I believe in Macro Evolution.

Why? Because the alternative would be to believe in someone I can't see.

I would rather believe in something I can't see than someone.

Evolution is the modern name we give for an ancient pagan myth. It's the story men for thousands of years have been telling their children about how long ago the animals, including the rational animal man, arose up out of the sea by chance.

What a revelation...scientists are just like people. They believe things.

MC

Re:, on: 2007/2/9 16:43

Most people that believe in Evolution (including, surprisingly, some Christians) seem unable to get their heads around the fact that Evolution requires a basic increase in INFORMATION at the genetic level. If the information isn't there already, in some form or another, nothing will happen. (Much information is "hidden" - which is why some family traits skip a generation, or mixed-race parents can have a child very much lighter or darker skinned than either)

There are animals that we could imagine have "evolved" to glide from tree to tree in forests eg, "flying" squirrels (or Dumbo???), not by adding anything, but by changes in parts of their bodies that were already there.

But that isn't really evolution because it needs no new information. The creatures already had flaps of skin or whatever, in the required places, they just got bigger, with the help of existing genetic information. So it isn't really evolution at all!

General Topics :: evolution

One basic kind of creature doesn't turn into a different kind. Flying squirrels never become anything except squirrels. Nor do they have the information to grow true wings and take to the skies like birds. Any more than the various breeds of dogs can become anything other than dogs.

God made everything "after its kind". Which is exactly what we see in nature - different basic sorts of plants and animals - that are similar to each other but very unlike those from a different "kind".

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/2/9 17:44

Compton,

I don't believe that evolution was mere "chance" but rather that the universe was programmed to develop life through the organic processes initially established with the big bang. The tails of comets traversing the universe were the source of much of the primary, basic building blocks of living things; namely, complex carbon molecules. As I understand it, these comets essentially were the "Johnny apple seeds" of God's original creation, spreading the basic components of life to vessels such as the earth, where they could develop according to God's plan.

Bub

Re: evolution, on: 2007/2/9 17:54

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:
Compton,

I don't believe that evolution was mere "chance" but rather that the universe was programmed to develop life through the organic processes initially established with the big bang. The tails of comets traversing the universe were the source of much of the primary, basic building blocks of living things; namely, complex carbon molecules. As I understand it, these comets essentially were the "Johnny apple seeds" of God's original creation, spreading the basic components of life to vessels such as the earth, where they could develop according to God's plan.

Bub

Fair enough, that's probably what you were taught, (so was I) but there's a lot of solid SCIENTIFIC evidence to suggest that it isn't so!

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: evolution is not true - posted by luckyd (), on: 2007/2/9 18:34

bubba evolution i know is not true because the bible does not say it is. maybe that sounds ingorant for christians to believe that the bible is literal but i used to also think that maybe evolution could work to gether. I thought it was not true when the bible talks about a dinosaur and a dragon. the bible is being made true more and more and evolution less and less

First i would like to tell you that there are more facts that the bible is true. For example dinosaurs. Did you know at one time everyone thought the world was flat and it was always taught long ago. There have been many claims such as that and eventually have been proven wrong...so about dinosaurs. we are always taught in school about how long ago dinosaurs lived and the different possibilites that happened for them to die out. Did you know there is more in the bible that proves evolution is false. For example a dinosaur print and human print were found together and dinosaur clay figures have been found made by people as well as cave drawings. tools and other things have also been found at the time of dinosaurs. a human was even found inside a dinosaur in this picture. <http://www.biblelandstudios.com/nuke/modules.php?name=News&file=print&sid=38> the bible in job talks about a dinosaur and a dragon very clearly and in fact there has been new evidence such as on the animal planet that dragons did exist. They even found a skeleton looking dragon figure with i believe if i remember correctly a sword with skeltons of humans... and it definitley didnt look like a dinosaur

General Topics :: evolution

r and again many say its a dragon. dragons were also talked about everywhere long ago and have been in drawings of past times. this was on the animal planet and there is more evidence other places. there is no proof for evolution. you might say ya but there is not proof that evolution didnt happen...yes there is proof evolution didnt happen. it starts with jesus . jesus changed my friends lives. They were druggies and one was a stripper and they were so unhappy and in gangs and now they are not. jesus saved them. I know the truth about jesus and i know the power he has had in my life. I had a girlfriend get saved and she always made fun of me and debated with me. she was smart when it came to religion yet she found jesus when she thought so intelegent in the worlds view. now heres the thing. Do i believe the evidence with evolution when we dont know if its real or do i believe what the bible says when i know jesus is real and that since hes god he used men to write the bible. and u might say they were just men and how could they write it perfect. Because maybe they arent perfect but god IS. and god can use anyone to do anything perfect in his name if he chooses to choose someone obedient. I will believe the bible because the one who i believe in who is perfect wrote it and he talks in job about a dinosaur and dragon and he says everything was made on the 6th day. like i said more evidence shows that dinosaurs lived with humans as well as dragons and so then evolution is wrong because everything was created on the 6th day. people were not apes either when they lived with dinosaurs because they could draw the dinosaurs. Now you can believe other things than when god says something about creation and believe god and know that it is literal or you can believe in evolution and say the bible is not literal. people say ok well where is the proof that evolution didnt happen. but like i said it is found with jesus. people cant see the proof that god is real because they wont change thier hearts to jesus and so they can never see the proof but thats 100% proof of creation but remember this, the bible has been 100% right so far with prophesies and scientist have been proven wrong many times. they say that some animals are extinct yet they end up being wrong because those animals end up being found alive. and you may believe evolution because of what scientist say, but remember this, your believing scientist with thier beliefs when our own human kind, gods own creation, im talking about humans, they left proof by making for us drawings of dinosaurs and clay models of dinosaurs to show they lived with dinosaurs. so i wrote all this to show you that its going to be sad as the bible keeps proving you wrong as more evidence is uncovered and u one day have to face god. I mean just not long ago dragons were made belief yet the bible has always talked about dragons and now just recently dragons were said to maybe be real afer all. And your so stubborn that one day i pray you find the truth and understand who god really is and that the bible is his literal word.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/2/9 18:50

Hi Bubba,

So you're telling me that you rather believe that a big explosion started the world, then God just speaking it into existence ? That's like saying that parts of a watch exploded and poof there's a watch, which is less complex than the earth. When we look at the watch we automatically think there's a designer, well we we look at the earth we can see design, so there must be a Designer.

I know we've asked this before, but how can you belive the other things in the Bible if you don't belive the account of God's creation? If you can't believe the foundation of the Bible how can you trust anything else in it?

It is by faith we believe this, but it takes far more faith to believe something came from nothing.

Jordan

Re: - posted by jordanamo, on: 2007/2/9 19:15

luckyd, if you want people to read your post, please paragraph... it's very long.

Trying to debate evolution is like trying to swat flies with your hand :-P

jordanamo

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/2/9 22:06

Hi Bub,

Thank you much for the gracious tone of your response.

Quote:
-----where they could develop according to God's plan.

I think I've asked you this before, but how do you see "developing according to God's plan" as being different than Intelligent Design? I'm not sure the late Stephen Gould, Edward Wilson, or Richard Dawkins would appreciate you having the creation sharing credit with the Creator! Their science insists that material processes alone can account for the complexity of life and that a designer is not "necessary".

Blessings,

MC

Re:, on: 2007/2/10 14:43

Compton,

Here's the ID explanation from the wikipedia.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intelligent_design

it says that ID argues for something different than natural selection, which is confusing to me because I see natural selection as part of the whole design of God. Why would God need to intervene in His creation as it worked to produce intelligent beings that have spiritual lives, such as ourselves? Wouldn't He get it right in the first place??!

Bub

Re:, on: 2007/2/10 15:43

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:
Compton,

Here's the ID explanation from the wikipedia.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intelligent_design

it says that ID argues for something different than natural selection, which is confusing to me because I see natural selection as part of the whole design of God. Why would God need to intervene in His creation as it worked to produce intelligent beings that have spiritual lives, such as ourselves? Wouldn't He get it right in the first place??!

Bub

Dear Bubba

First, as was said, thanks for your gracious responses - especially when we all dump on you!

No scientist would doubt the reality of Natural Selection - its still happening today! But it could never be a mechanism for Evolution, as some - even scientists - often seem to imagine. .

The reason is that Natural Selection *is going in the opposite direction* from Evolution! Natural Selection often causes a LOSS in genetic complexity, not a gain (which Evolution requires).

We can see that more clearly in "unnatural" selection, such as dog breeding. "Pure" bred dogs often have genetic weaknesses specific to the breed, and are far less healthy than crosses. The "pure", inbred varieties just don't have enough genetic variation, which is why breeders have such hard work to get healthy stock and breed out faults.

Another example: When men first spread to all parts of the world, some would have ended up in tropical countries while others moved to temperate or colder areas. In hotter areas a dark skin is an advantage because of the r

risk of skin cancer etc. In colder areas dark skin is a DISadvantage because vitamin D is made in the skin with the help of sunlight, and a dark skin cuts down on this.

So dark skinned people had an advantage in hot areas, and light-skinned in colder areas. In the first, light skinned folk were less healthy and didn't live as long, in the second it was the other way around. Eventually the ability to produce a lot of dark skin colour may have died out completely in some populations living in cold countries - the "white" races. And white-skinned folk might die out in the hotter areas.

This is an example of natural selection through "survival of the fittest", not Evolution.

Can you see any evidence of gain in genetic complexity in the example?

Mmm that turns the idea of "White superiority" on its head!

Hope that helps.

Jeannette

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/2/10 15:49

this film is great, or so i thought :-) hope it helps someone , proof of Gods existence

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-1760096128712631511&q=chuck+missler&hl=en>

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/2/10 15:53

Hello Bubba,

Curious mixture here...

Quote:
-----Why would God need to intervene in His creation as it worked to produce intelligent beings that have spiritual lives, such as ourselves? Wouldn't He get it right in the first place??!

Isn't 'getting it right the first time' a creationist position? ;-) I feel your question misses an essential doctrine of natural selection; namely that the evolutionary record is not a story of getting it right the first time, but a series of mysterious extinctions and even cataclysmic familial dead ends.

One could reply to your subjective question with equal subjectivity, "Why didn't God get it right the first time?" Why would it take Him 4 billion years to 'produce intelligent beings with spiritual lives?'

Thanks,

MC

Re: film, on: 2007/2/10 15:57

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:
this film is great, or so i thought :-) hope it helps someone , proof of Gods existence

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-1760096128712631511&q=chuck+missler&hl=en>

Didn't have time tonight to watch all of it, but liked the bit seen!

Jeannette

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/2/10 16:07

id recomend if you only have a little time, watch from 12 min into the movie and just watch a couple of minutes , its amazing what a creator we have!!!

Re: evolution - posted by NewCovWinDor (), on: 2007/2/10 17:08

Greetings!

One thing to keep in mind... the best way to detect a counterfeit is to know the original!

"In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth."

We can certainly trust that God's Word is telling us the truth. Wherever science may seem to "contradict" it, we can easily say that it is the "science" that is at fault. After all, men's theories have changed and will continue to change no matter how sure he may be of them.

Yet, God's Word has not changed a bit, and never shall... "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but My words shall not pass away."

We must keep this in mind as we navigate the treacherous waters of our flesh-crippled reasoning. "My ways are not your ways, and your thoughts are not My thoughts."

Praise the Lord for the wonderful mind He has endowed us with... and praise the Lord for the faith that tempers it!

Here are a few websites that I have found helpful in the Creation/Evolution/ID/Compromise debate.

www.answersingenesis.org

Excellent general resource. Some articles a bit repetitive, but lots of information nonetheless. AiG is one of the oldest and largest Young-Earth Creationist sites on the web.

www.creationontheweb.org

CMI is an Australian organization formerly affiliated with AiG, though now an independent. Has links to a huge variety of articles from Creation magazine.

www.icr.org

Another old and well-established apologetics ministry. Lots of information available.

www.globalflood.org

Very scholarly and in-depth... a bit over my head! Deals with lots of the technical details of the world-wide disaster known as 'Noah's flood'... the probable cause of the millions of ancient fossil relics that have been recovered.

www.worldwideflood.com

This one is a little more on the layman's level. Lots of pictures, diagrams and articles relating to the Noachian flood. Pro

motes some 'free-thinking' with regard to ark shape... still very interesting.

Yes, these are mostly all from literal-six-day-young-earth-creationist-Bible-thumpers... but I'm one too, so that doesn't bother me!

In all seriousness, though, we must be careful to read all 'information' objectively. Wikipedia.org is a good place to look for general secular information regarding evolution, but be forewarned that they will have a secular slant to them; just as the above websites do to the Christian worldview! (Personally, I'd rather be a little more to God's side than the World's side, don't you think?)

Remember... God's Word is the absolute authority. What the Lord says goes, no matter how loud the World may shout otherwise.

Farewell in Jesus,

Re:, on: 2007/2/10 17:09

Compton,

I don't think it really matters what physical forms our spiritual beings developed within. If evolution had taken a different turn, perhaps a reptilian form of life would have developed the mental capacities and spiritual identities of mammalian humans. Perhaps this is happening on other planets. The point is to explore the Creation and come to know and worship the Creator through this process.

God got it right because the universe produces life in abundance. Cherish it and praise God!

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by NewCovWinDor (), on: 2007/2/10 17:56

Greetings, brethren!

As I said previously, "What the Lord says goes."

"And God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good."
(Genesis 1:31)

Keep that phrase 'very good' in your mind.

A question to consider:

Can we consider death to be a normal part of life? After all, "Time and Death are the keys to Evolution."

Let's think a bit here...

It appears that death is not a normal part of life (as it was originally intended), for we can see that both in Genesis 3 and in everyday life... look at the tragedy of a human's death, or even that of a pet or something else. We feel revulsion at the sight and smell of death. If it is so alien to us, how can we explain its ghastly existence?

My next question would be:

Would God, Who is HOLY, RIGHTEOUS, PURE and LOVING, have placed Adam and Eve over the top of a fossil graveyard full of dead things that were simply 'not good enough to make it'? That is the essence of macro-Evolution, as we saw above. Could such an evolving world rightly be called 'very good'? Why would He make man to decay and die, especially in a 'very good' world? Why is there death?

Let's also consider the Lake of Fire, the place where Satan, his angels and ungodly men shall be cast in the Judgement; it is a place "Prepared for the Devil and his angels...", not prepared originally for man! So, why is it there? Why is there death, and then punishment for the wicked at the end?

The answer is a simple, three-letter word called SIN... with the letter "I" right in the middle of it. It's about choices.

Choices that men make.

God, in this 'very good' world He created, made a Garden and placed man therein. He gave one (and only one) negative command... "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Very simple and easy to obey, but man decided to rebel. He had a simple choice... even as we have the choice during a time of temptation. He chose to yield to the words of his wife and the serpent that deceived her. To disobey is to rebel. To rebel is to sin. To sin is to die.

Now, we have a sin-cursed world that is full of suffering and death. It is only being sustained by God's hand... until the End. Why is there death? Because of man's sin. Death is the payment for sin... "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." (cf. Ezekiel 18)

That is why origins are so critical. Christians are made the laughingstock of the world because we don't have answers to their questions, or because we kow-tow to their changing ideas of origins. We can't explain death and suffering!

"If God created the world, then He created you. If God created you, then God owns you. If God owns you, then He sets the rules."

(Ken Ham, apologist)

This is why the world is trying so hard to disprove the Bible, or twist it out of context (e.g. Gap Theory, Theistic Evolution, Progressive Creationism and a host of others). It is the seed of rebellion that sprouted in man's heart the moment he yielded to temptation.

"Lord, give Thy servants strength and unction to speak out against the wickedness of this fallen world. Let us not be afraid to stand on Your Word and speak your Truth boldly with our lives and our mouths."

Hallelujah, amen!

Re:, on: 2007/2/11 13:19

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:
Compton,

I don't think it really matters what physical forms our spiritual beings developed within. if evolution had taken a different turn, perhaps a reptilian form of life would have developed the mental capacities and spiritual identities of mammalian humans. perhaps this is happening on other planets. the point is to explore the Creation and come to know and worship the Creator through this process.

God got it right because the universe produces life in abundance. Cherish it and praise God!

Bubbaguy

But what some of us are trying to say is that

1. While God *could* have used Evolution as a mechanism for creating life, the Bible says (in Genesis, which is a historical, not a symbolic book) that He didn't! So we have to choose who to believe, God or man!

2. Evolution, as well as being bad theology, is bad science!

What the Bible says happened (for example that all living things were created as distinct "kinds") actually ties in far better with true science than Evolution does.

Scientifically, it is basically impossible that Evolution could even have got started from the "primordial slime", however many billions of years there were.

...I know where you are coming from, because I was there too. We have been brainwashed by pseudo-scientific ideas that are basically anti-God.

So, not only is Evolution opposed to what the Bible says happened, it is not even properly verified by good scientific methods. In my view, Evolution is not even fit to be called a theory. Its just an extremely unlikely hypothesis, made by men who reject God. Tragically it has by now deceived many - even some of "the elect" - such as yourself.

You have probably been reading too much popular science and science fiction. (Been there, done that, the Lord gave me strength to throw away the T-shirt :-)). He had to set my mind and spirit free from this horrible anti-God worldview, that pretends Evolution is scientific - to such an extent that it deceives even scientists.

Romans 1:

19; For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. 20; Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse; 21; for although they knew God they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds were darkened. 22; Claiming to be wise, they became fools, 23; and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles.

Jeannette

Re: - posted by MikeH, on: 2007/3/12 6:42

Sorry to take so long to reply, but, LittleGift, you have declared openly that you are an evolutionist!!!

Quote:

-----LittleGift wrote:

This is an example of natural selection through "survival of the fittest", not Evolution.

The evolutionists claim that there is a process of natural (as opposed to divine or intelligent design) selection, that selects the creature with the genetic material that enables it to survive best within the environment it finds itself. The mechanism of natural selection is 'the survival of the fittest'. That is those creatures whose genetic material best equips them for the environment in which they find themselves, whether by being better able to find or use food, better able to find or attract mates and therefore reproduce, better able to survive the climate or other external circumstances, those creatures survive and by pass on their genetic material to the next generation. Their genes may only give them a small advantage, but over several generations or maybe several hundred generations, they will begin to predominate. Your dark and white skin example, if it is valid, would have any evolutionist jumping for joy that a Christian supports their views.

Quote:

-----LittleGift wrote:

The reason is that Natural Selection is going in the opposite direction from Evolution! Natural Selection often causes a LOSS in genetic complexity, not a gain (which Evolution requires).

This is simply not true. There are several ways that creatures can gain genetic materials, plasmids, viruses, mutations, errors during meiosis etc. The transfer of antibiotic resistance between different types of bacteria is a well documented example of one of these natural techniques where new genetic materials is acquired by bacteria that previously did not have it and so providing them with enzymes that destroy antibiotics. This enables them to *survive as the fittest*, whereas their fellow bacteria without these new genes are killed. Once gained, if that genetic material gives an advantage one will be natural selected for, and it works well for bacteria which we are trying to destroy with our modern drugs. So natural selection causes neither a gain or loss of genetic material, it is other mechanisms that do this. What natural selection does, is select those who having gained or changed their genetic material and are better able to prosper in their current environment?

Are you really an evolutionist?

Mike

Re: dialing 411 - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/3/12 10:39

Hi everyone.

MikeH, how are you? I wanted to comment upon something you suggested here...

"There are several ways that creatures can gain genetic materials, plasmids, viruses, mutations, errors during meiosis etc. The transfer of antibiotic resistance between different types of bacteria is a well documented example of one of these natural techniques where new genetic materials is acquired by bacteria that previously did not have it and so providing them with enzymes that destroy antibiotics."

As I understand it though, it's **new** genetic information that is the issue, not **pre-existing genetic materials** or the transfer of it? For instance, copying an encyclopedia does not explain the origin of its contents, know what I mean? I mean accounting for the emergence of **every new instance** of genetic information...

Follow it back all the way...

As I've read about this, the explanations I've heard for all of this sound more and more like story telling. Creative minds can make up all sorts of stories about the unobservable past that do not have to be tested by being repeated in the present. It may sound convincing with lots of technical jargon but none of that jargon has the quality of real-life, real-time experience that meet the demands of life in this real-world, you know? They may work in the sterile environments of laboratories, under the control of *intelligent-designers* but none of that says anything about how these thought-experiments would perform in the real world where no-one was watching, and no-one cared about the end results, or how these stories would actually play out with no-one in control. It may be nice to *suppose* that time and chance can produce wonders and miracles but real-life experience seems to yell out that machines are the products of minds and purpose, biological or otherwise.

It all seems like professional storytelling. That never ends.

Sort of reminds you of Acts 17:21.

There are some messages here at Sermonindex on this subject you all may be encouraged by...

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/viewcat.php?cid104>) Dr. A.E. Wilder-Smith

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid712&commentViewItemComments>) Is Man a Machine?

Considering all of this, what a powerful declaration this is:

In the beginning, was the Word...

Re: - posted by MikeH, on: 2007/3/16 13:34

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

As I understand it though, it's **new** genetic information that is the issue, not **pre-existing** *genetic materials* or the transfer of it? For instance, copying an encyclopedia does not explain the origin of it's contents, know what I mean? I mean accounting for the emmergence of **every new instance** of genetic information...

No, all of the things I mentioned could create new genetic material. It might be modified forms of existing genetic material, but once any of it exists (and how it might have been created is a subject of a different topic), then making more and more with different characteristics is not difficult to imagine. A scientist could probably create and select for antibiotic resistant bacteria in a couple of days. Now many of the things that happens in nature may not be very useful, but if it becomes useful eventually, then it would be selected for. If there are 100 millions of years, then maybe it could happen.

I'm not trying to support evolution, but if we use bad science for our arguments, then I think we do more disservice to the Lord's cause than if we simply accept that we can't always answer all the questions that there are. Even if we could answer every question anyone had, there is no guarantee they would become a christian, because it is still the 'hearing of faith' that saves us, not an intellectual assent to Christian dogma. I think we all too easily believe that we have to convince people to become Christians; they need to hear God speak to them, through us by the Holy Spirit. (1 Thess 2v13). It is interesting that one of the greatest commentaries on creation is in the book of Job, by God himself. Job's reaction, "have you considered the idea of evolution?" Not at all, Job's response was:

Quote:
-----Job 40:3-5 Then Job answered the LORD, and said, (4) Behold, I am vile; what shall I answer thee? I will lay mine hand upon my mouth. (5) Once have I spoken; but I will not answer: yea, twice; but I will proceed no further.

When God speaks to us about these things, our arguments rapidly come to an end!!

Kind regards
Mike

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/3/16 17:33

Hi Mike, how are you?

"When God speaks to us about these things, our arguments rapidly come to an end!!"

This made me think of Romans 1:20, where the Apostle says

"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse"

In a sense, isn't this passage of scripture saying that He has **already** spoken to each of us? And yet, it seems to me that the theory of evolution is an attempt by man to alter what God has said, in creation, or to deny He has said it altogether.

And the claims of its proponents are given credibility because it is called science, and when many of us think of science, we think of the kinds of things that put men on the Moon, not elaborate *storytelling* about things that **could** have happened, given enough time, and some imagination on our parts. You know what I mean?

Chris

Re:, on: 2007/3/16 18:57

Quote:

MikeH wrote:

Sorry to take so long to reply, but, LittleGift, you have declared openly that you are an evolutionist!!!

Quote:

-----LittleGift wrote:

This is an example of natural selection through "survival of the fittest", not Evolution.

The evolutionists claim that there is a process of natural (as opposed to divine or intelligent design) selection, that selects the creature with the genetic material that enables it to survive best within the environment it finds itself. The mechanism of natural selection is "the survival of the fittest". That is those creatures whose genetic material best equips them for the environment in which they find themselves, whether by being better able to find or use food, better able to find or attract mates and therefore reproduce, better able to survive the climate or other external circumstances, those creatures survive and by pass on their genetic material to the next generation. Their genes may only give them a small advantage, but over several generations or maybe several hundred generations, they will begin to predominate. Your dark and white skin example, if it is valid, would have any evolutionist jumping for joy that a Christian supports their views.

Quote:

-----LittleGift wrote:

The reason is that Natural Selection is going in the opposite direction from Evolution! Natural Selection often causes a LOSS in genetic complexity, not a gain (which Evolution requires).

This is simply not true. There are several ways that creatures can gain genetic materials, plasmids, viruses, mutations, errors during meiosis etc. The transfer of antibiotic resistance between different types of bacteria is a well documented example of one of these natural techniques where new genetic materials is acquired by bacteria that previously did not have it and so providing them with enzymes that destroy antibiotics. This enables them to *survive as the fittest*, whereas their fellow bacteria without these new genes are killed. Once gained, if that genetic material gives an advantage one will be natural selected for, and it works well for bacteria which we are trying to destroy with our modern drugs. So natural selection causes neither a gain or loss of genetic material, it is other mechanisms that do this. What natural selection does, is select those who having gained or changed their genetic material and are better able to prosper in their current environment?

Are you really an evolutionist?

Mike

Hi Mike. Thought this thread was finished, and only just noticed that its popped up again.

Of course I'm not an Evolutionist! :eek:

I was trying to explain that Natural Selection can never give rise to Evolution, however many billions of years there were. Natural selection almost always results in a loss of genetic richness in the population, unless there is some kind of "cross-breeding" effect from other populations that confers extra genetic variety, as sometimes happens with antibiotic resistant bacteria.

As you said, they normally become resistant either by transfer of already existing genetic material from other strains of bacteria, or by **errors** in the proteins in their outer coats. These proteins, or DNA, already exist, so this is not Evolution, any more than skin colour variations, or sickle cell disease in humans is. Yet both those genetic differences can confer advantages in a population.

The altered, antibiotic resistant, bacteria are often less able to survive in other ways than normal bacteria. They only have an advantage when in the presence of antibiotics that kill off the competition. You get the same kind of effect with plants if you mow your lawn regularly!

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/3/16 19:12

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

As you said, they normally become resistant either by transfer of already existing genetic material from other strains of bacteria, or by errors in the proteins in their outer coats.

Just realised that you didn't say the underlined part. I think that this is the usual or most common means of antibiotic or antibody resistance, rather than enzymes against antibiotics. As I understand it, what normally happens is that a special section of the antibiotic (or antibody) usually fits a part of the outer coat of the bacteria as a key fits a lock. Either this blocks some vital process, or breaks down the outer coating, killing the bacteria.

A very slight alteration in the outer coat may mean that the "key" no longer fits, so the bacteria are resistant.

This works with viruses too. Colds and flu change their outer coats all the time, which makes it almost impossible to gain resistance to them. Other viruses change very little, which is why you don't often get measles or mumps more than once.

True "Evolution" would involve bacteria changing into something else. They've had billions and trillions of generations to do it in, yet never a sign of that happening to the most super of superbugs!

Jeannette

Re: just an aside, on: 2007/3/17 14:54

ever see the bumpersticker that said "if guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns"?

i have a bumper sticker on my car that reads:

"if evolution is outlawed, only outlaws will evolve."

:)

bub

Re:, on: 2007/3/17 18:49

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:

ever see the bumpersticker that said "if guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns"?

i have a bumper sticker on my car that reads:

"if evolution is outlawed, only outlaws will evolve."

:)

bub

HAHAHA! :-D Bubba, you amaze me. You have a different opinion from most of us on this topic, which it seems that no amount of reasoning can shift. Yet you never seem to be bothered by any of the contrary arguments.

I wish you were willing to be convinced that Evolution is unscientific, but you have a great attitude towards controversy!

But don't you have a problem with not believing what *God* says? What you, or the rest of us, think isn't in the end import

ant, but what the Lord says is...

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: mowing the lawn, on: 2007/3/18 6:58

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

The altered, antibiotic resistant, bacteria are often less able to survive in other ways than normal bacteria. They only have an advantage when in the presence of antibiotics that kill off the competition. You get the same kind of effect with plants if you mow your lawn regularly!

Does that mean my lawn will evolve if I keep mowing it for millions of years? :knockedout:

There will certainly be Natural Selection. Some plants that used to be there will die out, (unless new seeds get in from somewhere else). And the individual plants that are most vigorous and most resistant to mowing will increase.

Natural selection merely favours the genes **already present**. The result is that the general population gets more resistant and the "unfit", in that environment, decrease or disappear altogether.

This actually *reduces* the genetic richness of the population, and *weakens* its ability to adapt if conditions change, for example, if I stop mowing the lawn altogether. Natural Selection doesn't produce anything new - rather the reverse.

Blessings

Jeannette