



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Whales' hip bones and the Bible

Whales' hip bones and the Bible, on: 2007/10/26 12:55

It seems best to start a new thread, as the thread on praying in public has been diverted by evolutionary debate

Quote:

----- Bubba said:

...they continue to argue that observable, testable science is false because of their insistence on a literal Genesis.

My main personal reason for disbelieving Evolution is because it is very bad science, neither observable nor testable!

The literal Genesis account actually fits the observed scientific facts much better than Evolution does!

When I first became a Christian (while doing a Biological sciences degree) I believed in Evolution, not even thinking that maybe it conflicted with the Genesis account. Someone challenged me about it and my angry reaction (for no obvious "scientific" reason) made it clear that I'd been brainwashed.

From that time, when I began to think for myself, and soon realised that Evolution was totally unscientific and didn't even merit the title of "theory".

Quote:

----- one of the best evidences for evolution are vestigial organs and bones. these are things like wings on the ostrich, which cannot fly. they once had usefulness but because of evolution, the animal has changed in such a manner that these are no longer useful. thus they atrophy.

Bub, that isn't evolution, its degeneration! Evolution requires adding of new information, not losing it!

I was reading an article just now. Here's a quote from it:

A CMI speaker visiting a cave in Australia was told by the guide about a blind shrimp which, in that lightless environment, had 'evolved the ability not to see'.

Can't you see the stupidity of the guide's remark?

And almost all "vestigial" organs in man have now been found to have very important functions. For example, the appendix, spleen, pineal and thymus glands and coccyx ("tail bone").

The ostrich's wings also have function - for example helping it to balance and make sharp turns when running, (a cheetah uses its tail for the same purpose).

When they first researched the human genome, (our DNA and how it fits together on the chromosomes) there was lots and lots of it that had no known function. Those who believed in Evolution hindered the discovery of its function by calling it "junk DNA" and (very unscientifically) assuming, on no evidence whatsoever, that it was made of "evolutionary leftovers".

Now the same scientists are finding, (probably to their surprise) that a lot of the "junk" has many vital functions after all, such as controlling the activity of other genes, e.g. "switching" them on or off at the right times.

Quote:

-----I mentioned the hip bones of the whale before. the whale is a mammal and its predecessors were clearly land animals. but they adapted, changed and now fit into a new ecological niche in the sea.

Actually it isn't at all clear; there is no evidence that their ancestors were land animals, only supposition. And, as with many other "vestigial" organs, the hip bones are actually just right for a whale to function.

I looked it up to make sure. Here's a couple of quotes from an article:

...When a cow swats the flies from its back, it moves its tail generally from side to side. A whale, however, can't do this. Not that it has to swat flies, but it does have to move its tail up and down in order to swim...

...Any land-dwelling mammal wishing to evolve into a whale could certainly practise moving its left-right tail in an up-down fashion, and there is no doubt that it could certainly improve up to a point. Maybe even learn to swim faster and catch more fish. But after that its tail movement would begin to crush its reproductive apparatus against its pelvis...

...Taken to extremes, this new tail movement would simply crush the whole pelvis. Such a transition would have no survival value whatsoever. The selective pressures of the environment, or natural selection, would work against any such change of tail on a land-dwelling mammal.

To make the claim as evolutionists do, that land-dwelling mammals evolved into sea-dwelling whales is to claim that there had to be simultaneous accidental genetic changes which allowed the tail to grow larger while the pelvis grew smaller. And all this ignores the problems caused as the ever shrinking pelvis or hip bones reached the point where they were far too small to support the creature's weight on its hind legs, and yet still too large to let the animal move its tail up and down with any efficiency.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v7/i1/whaletail.asp>

Quote:
-----my point to Christian participants on this site is to get real. evolutionary and biological scientists are not out to void the Word or undermine your faith...

Bub, you are the one who needs to get real, and understand what is **real science** and what isn't! Who says they are, "out to void the Word or undermine your faith"? With the exception of stupid people like that fellow Dawkins, ("The fool says in his heart there is no God") they aren't out to destroy faith, but are simply deceived.

I disbelieve in Evolution on scientific grounds - even if it were true it would have no effect whatsoever on my faith.

I'm sure others on the forum would say the same.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: whalebone corsets, on: 2007/10/26 13:54

Have been doing a bit of research and found this article http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v20/i3/whale_leg.asp

"I knew, of course, that some modern whales have a pair of bones embedded in their tissues, each of which strengthens the pelvic wall and acts as an organ anchor. I knew that evolutionists generally claim that these small, yet purposeful structures are vestigial ('left-over') organs. They choose to believe that each bone of the pair is all that is left of the pelvic bone of the whale's ancestor which, according to evolutionary doctrine, once walked and ran on land. They believe this is even though these strips of bone have a known function, differ in males and females, and are not even attached to the vertebral column.

I think it's interesting anyway :-)

Jeannette

Re: Whales' hip bones and the Bible - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2007/10/26 14:44

Hi LittleGift...

I think that it is a good idea to separate the two ideas discussed in the Public Prayer thread.

I want to make it clear that I am NOT an evolutionist (I think that this was clear from my posts). But I do want to say that I understand some of the things that Brother Bubba was trying to say. Christians are often very quick to comment on such matters (like the theory of evolution). Most of the time, they tend to attack the integrity of the person with whom they disagree. Those who desire to "contend" often fail to even adequately understand the issue -- except from a certain surface familiarity of the topic. Some are quick to point to books as "sources" UNTIL it comes time to validate such sources. At this time, they usually prefer to "stick with what the Bible says" about the issue. The people of this world are quick to point at the fanaticism that is associated with such behavior. It is strange that some people who attempt to contend for the faith against evolution almost take pride in considering themselves "foolish" (equating it with uneducated). As a result, the world views Christians as less intelligent beings with their fingers in their ears to anything that might contradict their beliefs. If we are to contend with intellectuals, we must understand what they believe and view them as at least sincere in their beliefs.

We need to wake up to a couple of facts. First of all, those who espouse a belief in "evolution" do not believe in a literal interpretation of the Bible. Many do not even regard the Bible as anything more than a biased, religious piece of ancient literature. So to "contend" for the faith using the Scriptures alone does not suffice in such a matter as this. Secondly, most of the people who believe in evolution do not believe in it because they want to. They believe in it because they sincerely believe that it is either scientifically proven, or is a facet of science that most adequately explains the accepted science today.

When we approach others in regards to this issue (and other similar matters), we can't approach them with an almost prideful "I'm right because the Bible says so!" attitude. Instead, we should either make an effort to understand the perspectives and beliefs of evolutionists -- or simply excuse ourselves from the conversation. I have often witnessed Christians "contend for the faith," when in reality, they were simply making all Christians look like "ignorant hicks."

This being said, I don't buy into evolution. I understand the principles as they are taught by scientists. But I simply do not believe that "natural selection" exists. I do, however, believe in the possibility of "cause and effect." There are no visible observations of evolution, as science says that it takes thousands of years for each step to become noticeable. However, many evolutionists point to certain changes as precursor moments of evolution (such as changes in skin and hair color, hair loss, animal camouflage, etc...). These sort of things are the only observable changes in the animal kingdom. How much of this is based upon our environment? Many scientists are increasingly turning toward a more rapid change in species due to interesting and sudden changes in the epigenome. New evidence is pointing that the children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of a smoker will be far more susceptible to cancer. The same is true with alcoholism, drug use, depression, schizophrenia and genetically induced obesity. Evidence is now pointed that changes can occur in the epigenome, which is subsequently carried on to at least the next few generations.

Scientists have long thought that environmental changes can literally affect the makeup of our DNA. Once upon a time, races were considered a possible fork in the road of human evolution. The races changed according to their environment by natural selection. But recent science has shown that transplanted second and third generation Blacks who move to colder environments actually produce children with lighter skin and eyes. Likewise, Caucasians who move to warmer environments develop more melatonin. Rather than being an indication of "natural selection," this is considered a result of rapid changes brought upon the epigenome by cause and effect. This sort of cause and effect process is currently being stipulated to explain everything from the widespread susceptibility of certain modern diseases (everything from autism, ADD, cancer and diabetes), the "alpha male" behavior of certain aggressive breeds, to the higher IQs found within certain family trees. Rather than 10,000 year old changes brought about by "natural selection," these changes are almost immediate.

The more I read on this, the more it resembles the "generational curses" as mentioned in the Bible. What we do can have subsequent and lasting impact on our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren! A recent study has already validated this idea amongst the children of smokers. We've long realized that the descendants of smokers have a greater susceptibility toward various kinds of cancers. Could the same be true for the increase in autism? Is there a common source for rapid increase in autism? Could it be a result of chemical changes induced by toothpaste from the 1940s, 1950s, or 1960s? Could it be a result of changes in the cognitive attention span brought about by modern forms of entertainment? Now, geneticists are considering the possibility that there are sudden changes in the DNA of the sperm or egg b

efore conception. Experts in this field are questioning whether or not other things can be as quickly passed down. Can cognitive ability be passed down as well? Some scientists wonder whether or not they have found a basis for the instinct of animals (such as the reason that a baby animal knows to drink milk, or how a young bird learns to fly). It is also being considered as to why it takes several generations to fully domesticate a species, and just as many to integrate the offspring of animals raised in captivity back into the wild.

This is not an embracement of "evolution." Rather, it may point out that the only "observations" of evolution are merely the result of cause/effect upon the genetic makeup of sperm and eggs. Instead of taking millions of years to produce noticeable change, it only takes one, two or three generations. These new concepts have yet to be properly discussed amongst evolutionary biologists – because they are only now being discussed amongst geneticists (including wildlife geneticists). Evolutionists point to supposed changes on the basis that it takes long periods of time for such changes to take place. Now, we realize that such changes are not necessarily the result of "natural selection" and can occur almost immediately.

These are merely some things to consider when discussing this issue.

: -)

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 14:55

ccchhhrrriiiss,

a good post. we continue to learn about the make up and linkages of life and will continue to do so for a long time. i still believe that the fossil record supports evolution. thanks

bub

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 15:52

Phew Chris, a lot to consider here!

I try to call people foolish only those whom the Bible calls foolish, it's never anything personal.

The idea that Evolution is scientific and belief in the Genesis account is anti-science does make me angry. Not with the person who says it (as I said, I was brainwashed that way too), but with the scientific blindness of many scientists, (which is sceptical about everything but the fact that Evolution is bad science) and the devilish deception that can turn things on their head like that.

I argue against Evolution mainly from a scientific standpoint, having been interested in Biology from a child, and taken a degree in it. (Worms and spiders were so much more interesting than dolls! And I once, aged about 5, asked my mother "how is a crocodile made?", meaning how is it put together).

As you say, you don't believe in Evolution, but have expressed some common misunderstandings about it, that I will try to touch on in the next post.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 16:18

Quote:

bubbaguy wrote:
...i still believe that the fossil record supports evolution.

Why, Bub? Have you ever studied the methods of paleontology, and the assumptions they often make, sometimes from the tiniest scattered bits of bone? Can't you even *try* to look at the scientific arguments from the other side, and consider if they make sense? There are resources that can be understood even by a non-scientist, just as there are pro-evolutionary resources.

When I realised I'd been brainwashed, I made it my business to try and look at the evidence objectively, and decide for myself if Evolution was a reasonable explanation for the observed facts. Even one of my lecturers, who made no claim to any faith at all, didn't believe in Evolution, on the basis of science alone.

Surely you owe it to yourself, and to your faith (whatever understanding of Genesis you have), to do the same?

You have accepted one very biased view without apparently any desire to question it. How about looking at the other (also so biased - there's no such thing as true objectivity) and see which is a more likely interpretation of the facts.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2007/10/26 16:37

Hi LittleGift...

Quote:
-----As you say, you don't believe in Evolution, but have expressed some common misunderstandings about it, that I will try to touch on in the next post.

Let me clarify: I believe in a literal interpretation of Genesis. I do not believe in the theory of evolution. However, I do understand HOW people who do believe in the theory come to such a conclusion. We should be careful to not just dismiss their beliefs as silly conclusions based upon ignorance. Rather, we should explain the holes in the theory without insulting the intelligence of the listener.

Hope this helps clarify my position on the matter.

:~)

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 17:03

Cchhrrriiss said

Quote:

Â... most of the people who believe in evolution do not believe in it because they want to. They believe in it because they sincerely believe that it is either scientifically proven, or is a facet of science that most adequately explains the accepted science today

Sadly, generations of scientists and ordinary people have stated (and mostly believed) that Evolution is scientifically proven. As someone said, if you state a lie as fact often enough people will believe it in the end. The same thing happens if you call a fact a lie.Â...

Quote:
-----I don't buy into evolution. I understand the principles as they are taught by scientists. But I simply do not believe that "natural selection" exists.

I think you have misunderstood the concept of "natural selection". Unless I have misunderstood you? Natural selection is an observed fact.

To illustrate how it works:

Someone passes round a box of sweets (candy) of different kinds. You are asked to pick out the ones you like. You like the green ones, someone else chooses the red ones; another person likes the yellow ones. You are all making a **selection**. Only purple and pink ones are left.

But what happens to the **variety** of the sweets in the box? We started off with FIVE different kinds, we are left with only two. So there is far less variety than before. The ones each of us have taken out have even less variety – only one. That is the result of selection, and its effect (even if it gives an advantage) is a loss of information, a loss of some characteristics, from a population.

But Evolution requires a gain of information, not a loss. So it's impossible for natural selection to bring about Evolution.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 17:18

Quote:

ccchhrrriiss wrote:
Hi LittleGift..

Quote:
-----As you say, you don't believe in Evolution, but have expressed some common misunderstandings about it, that I will try to touch on in the next post.

Let me clarify: I believe in a literal interpretation of Genesis. I do not believe in the theory of evolution. However, I do understand HOW people who do believe in the theory come to such a conclusion. We should be careful to not just dismiss their beliefs as silly conclusions based upon ignorance. Rather, we should explain the holes in the theory without insulting the intelligence of the listener.

Hope this helps clarify my position on the matter.

:-)

Your position on this point was already clear, but there did seem to be a misunderstanding on just one point, (on careful reading) - natural selection.

..So, do you think I'm "dismissing their beliefs as silly conclusions based upon ignorance"?

This has never been the intention.

Maybe it was because of stressing that I *do* know what I'm talking about, and argue from the basis of science on this particular subject.

But Biblically, Evolution is foolish and a lie. God says so, not me, so why not agree with Him?!

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/10/26 17:55

Hi again Chris

You made an interesting point about epigenome changes happening quickly.

However, I'm not sure if this could (even in theory) be a mechanism for Evolution, any more than natural selection can. - And for the same reasons - no basic increase in genetic information, only changes in what is already present, or in the way certain genes are expressed.

I would be interested in what you think...

Although maybe this discussion is getting a bit too technical...? Even though your examples gave the general idea, most people won't have heard of epigenomes.

Jeannette