

**Compiled Messages**[Download](#) [Close](#)**Message no. 33**Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Saturday, February 19, 2005 7:55pm**Subject: Creation vs. Evolution - Discussion Post #1**

Both evolution and creation viewpoints have the same shortcoming - neither can be conclusively shown to be what really happened.

The "Evolution Happens" article poses the question "Isn't it true that evolution as a theory cannot be observed or tested?" to which it responds "No, this is not true," and then proceeds to list some current "examples" of evolution. However, when creationists state that evolution cannot be observed or tested any more than creation, they are referring to past evolution - the evolutionary process that supposedly produced the variety of life we have today. The assumption that evolution can happen does not logically and of necessity lead to the assertion that it did occur.

"Evolution Happens" argues that creation was not "chosen because it best explains the evidence," but imply that evolution was. However, the "Handy Dandy Evolution Refuter" counters with the point that while creationists do look at the facts starting with the assumption that God exists, evolutionists look at the facts WITH THE ASSUMPTION that God does NOT exist. Both of these are foundational assumptions to understanding existence as a whole - step back and think about why one is any more or less valid than the other.

The creationist viewpoint DOES accept and explain the evidence just as evolutionary theory does. Creationism does not throw out objective data that it may not "like." The problem is that very little data is clear-cut - most of it could be looked at from either perspective with equal validity. Look at it this way:

---

Say there was a small bush growing at the foot of a cliff. On this bush a single twig had been broken off. Slight indentations in the ground - vaguely, possibly resembling foot tracks - were near the bush. Additionally, a small rock lay on the ground near the bush. Now let's suppose that two people come to analyze the broken twig - one firmly believes, for other reasons, that a man had come by and broken off the twig for a purpose, and he points to the apparent foot-track as evidence, dismissing the rock as insignificant. The other person adamantly believes, for other reasons, that no men have been in the area recently and therefore the twig must have been broken by "natural" causes, pointing to the nearby rock as evidence, and dismissing the possible but unlikely foot track as insignificant.

---

Who is right? The evidence in both cases is circumstantial. It could have been either or perhaps a man using a rock; it is even possible that neither man nor the rock was the cause of the broken twig. In the case of circumstantial evidence, one's assumptions, subtle or overt, will influence one's interpretation. The bottom line is this - without having been there to observe the event, one cannot know for certain the cause of the broken twig. Both sides could continue to drum up more circumstantial evidence to support their view, but in the end the decision would have to be one of faith - accepting without conclusive proof - believing without seeing.

-Jonathan

**Message no. 45**[Branch from no. 33]Posted by **Sarah Ball** on Monday, February 21, 2005 1:12am**Subject: Re: Creation vs. Evolution - Discussion Post #1**

I think you make several valid points Jonathan. Neither theory can be satisfactorily proven, at least not for me. Much of scientific fact is based on assumptions, so how can it be fact at all? Take for example, fossils. We just assume that it takes millions of years to create things like this, but how could we ever possibly know for sure that that is the case. The same can be said for evolution. We can see that there are common links to different animals today, but there aren't ANY animals that are currently evolving, even when placed in situations or climates where it would benefit them to.

**Message no. 53**[Branch from no. 45]Posted by **Christina Carrasco** on Monday, February 21, 2005 9:22am**Subject: Re: Creation vs. Evolution - Discussion Post #1**

One thing that I have always found interesting about evolution and their theory is that although they do not believe in God a lot of the things they accept like you mention towards the end of your article are in fact by faith, which I find contradicting. Not a lot of things in life can be fully proven to be true, and at some point we can choose to accept or reject different theorys.

**Message no. 48**[Branch from no. 33]

Posted by **Cathryn Hill** on Monday, February 21, 2005 3:19am

**Subject: Re: Creation vs. Evolution - Discussion Post #1**

I think the example you give of the twig from the bush is an excellent one for this subject!  
Cathryn Hill

---

**Message no. 34**

Posted by **Jimenez Elizabeth** on Saturday, February 19, 2005 8:24pm

**Subject: Compare and Contrast of evolutionary theory and scientific creationism**

Evolutionary Theory states that all species came from one. Which also means that they share some common features from ancestors. Then over time that species evolves into another and goes through mutations which change some features. Now creationism is that science is observed and cannot always discover the truth. Science is always changing, and all human activities are always influenced by assumptions and opinions.

The shortcomings that I believe are both in these theories are that evolution says some truth like we had to come from somewhere. And also the Lamarckian theory that for example one giraffe had a short neck but after the ancestor had a bigger neck to reach the truth I believe that this is true. Some things in creationism I disagree with is that they say Charles Darwin developed natural selection from others because where did all his information come from.

---

**Message no. 35**

Posted by **Michelle Bower** on Saturday, February 19, 2005 9:07pm

**Subject: the truth**

Evolutionary theory states that all living and extinct things come from a original simple organism, and has developed through the years. On the other hand, scientific creationism states that God created everything in six days, and had a pain for his creation. In the article named "Handy Dandy Evolution Refuter", it says that both views are equal in religion, science, and involve faith. I believe that it takes more faith to believe in a random series of acts than a master designer. Therefore, I believe in scientific creationism.

---

**Message no. 37**[Branch from no. 35]

Posted by **Jonathan Geer** on Sunday, February 20, 2005 12:06pm

**Subject: Re: the truth**

Very Well said  
JJ (c;

---

**Message no. 38**

Posted by **Jonathan Geer** on Sunday, February 20, 2005 12:30pm

**Subject: Create and Evolve :-P**

In the "Evolutionary Happens" I find that they confuse Natural Selection and survival of the fittest with Evolution. The website uses the example of Viruses and how they change, however, doesn't our own immune system change and create anti-bodies as we come in contact with viruses. Viruses themselves learn how to survive by creating anti-bodies to the medicines that we use to control it.

Normally when you want to successfully support your view and if you believe in it you shouldn't be threatened. I think the writer of "Evolutionary Happens" may feel that their are shortcomings in his theory, he therefore resorts to name calling and says if you are a creationist you do not have an open mind; "Nearly all creationists are religious fundamentalists and will continue to stand by their position regardless of whether or not the evidence supports it." Also he says Creationism is not a science, I agree, "Neither evolution nor creation can be either proved or disproved by science, so believers in evolution or creation must accept either view by faith." (Handy Dandy).

I do see a short-coming also in creationism though, the term "Ex nihilo," which they base their beliefs that Nothing comes from nothing. I find that statement a little hard to prove because Where Did God Come From, if nothing comes from nothing He Himself should have a beginning or an end.

Both topics need to be studied with an open mind. The gov. said recently in regards to SS; Your view on this subject depends on how much you trust the gov. I think in some respect the same thing applies, does one wish to acknowledge a superior being and thinking he is in control, or does one prefer the idea that life is left up to chance?

Jonathan

---

**Message no. 50**[Branch from no. 38]

Posted by **Ashley Rader** on Monday, February 21, 2005 8:24am

**Subject: Re: Create and Evolve :-P**

You have some very interesting arguments but there are several facts you brought up in the beginning of your post that I wish to refute. First, viruses are not living: they don't have an immune system and therefore cannot manufacture antibodies. Second, our immune system doesn't evolve or change it simply manufactures antibodies that attack the virus. In the case of the AIDS virus as an example, the immune system is destroyed and no

antibodies are manufactured. The "ex nihilo" argument is a good one and I agree that God should have a beginning and an end. The creationists will counter that God has simply always been here and always will be. That being said, it is equally likely that everything necessary for the universe has always been here and always will be.

---

**Message no. 59**[Branch from no. 50]

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:15pm

**Subject: Re: Create and Evolve :-P**

Ashley is correct in her statement that creationists "will counter that God has simply always been here and always will be." Ultimately there are three options for the beginning of existence as we know it. Either matter/energy has always existed, a supernatural being (God) has always existed, or something came from nothing. Of these, I would say that the "something came from nothing" point of view is the hardest to justify logically. Many believe that if we are going to allow for eternal existence, we shouldn't bother with God at all - why not just suppose that matter/energy always existed?

This is where the argument exists over whether such a complex existence could still be after such a long period of time. Supposing that the universe (matter/energy as we know it) has existed an infinite length of time, it should have already reached thermal equilibrium - no remaining differences in energy state. Evolutionists counter with the big bang / big crunch perpetuation combo, but then this doesn't fit with the fact that the universe is accelerating outward. By this time, the details involve aspects of science that few learn about and none understand completely, which makes it very difficult to argue the point conclusively, as there is a perpetual back-and-forth of opinions and interpretations.

For me, the complexity and order (adherence to "laws") of existence - everything from a cell to an eye to the universe - screams intelligent design. As overused as this type of illustration may be, it still fits: How many planets with all the necessary natural resources and how long would it take to randomly produce a perfect swiss watch? Would it ever happen? Theoretically, yes, but in reality.....???? Human beings are FAR more ordered, complicated, and efficient than a watch.

---

**Message no. 60**[Branch from no. 38]

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:17pm

**Subject: Re: Create and Evolve :-P**

Jonathan brought up an interesting point at the end of his post. He said: "does one wish to acknowledge a superior being and thinking he is in control, or does one prefer the idea that life is left up to chance?" I would say that this is one of the biggest determinants of a person's view on origin. Many are unwilling to acknowledge a superior being because they know it makes them accountable to it. Many "prefer the idea that life is left up to chance" because it means that ultimately they have no one to answer to for their actions. Acknowledgement of a supreme being means acknowledgement of a supreme authority, and many are afraid to acknowledge that supreme authority because of the things he may ask them to do or to give up that they have no desire to comply with.

---

**Message no. 39**

Posted by **Brent Sullivan** on Sunday, February 20, 2005 4:37pm

**Subject: On Evolution and Creationism**

Compare and contrast the evolutionary theory and scientific creationism explanations for how life began. What shortcomings do you feel exist with each theory?

Two reputable theories each with a completely different yet intertwining background that ultimately set out to explain the origin of everything and everyone ever. Intriguing, isn't it?

Evolution; the anti-fundamentalist view that really explains things in terms of what the layperson can understand. Using scientific data from millions of years, scientists supporting evolution argue that through the scientific method they have derived a set of theories that really can BEST explain the origins of life on Earth and not merely try to disprove the opposing theory. Evolution says that changes occur in the make-up of species over long periods of time through mutations that acclimate the species to better survival which in turn makes it more apt to reproduce. In essence; evolution is the gathering of random mutations (changes, that are sometimes helpful but mostly maladaptive) that have the greatest chance of survival. If an organism evolves into something that has an advantage over another organism than the first will ultimately spread more easily; each creature comes from an earlier less developed (unaffected by mutation), and thus not as customized to the environment. This position on the origin of life isn't easily refuted since its supporters are some of the most intelligent on Earth (Tosaw, 2002). But, still advocates of creationism seek really to disprove this theory rather than straighten their own argument.

Creationism holds that God has ordained all life on Earth in a six-day creation as told in the Bible. Each creature is completely unique and is its own and not the ancestor or mutation of another. God has created Earth through His goodness and will and under His

control, not the whim of mere biology. But creationism is really harder to grasp for those with a scientific method background. It seems that creationists really only seek to refute evolution rather than promote their own studies to further explain their beliefs. In essence Creationists seek to prove their theories by disproving evolutionist theories that seem to be winning at this point in time. This would be the fundamentalist flaw that sets the foundation of this biblical-based idea that's strength lies in the undermining of its greatest foe.

---

**Message no. 62**[Branch from no. 39]

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:36pm

**Subject: Re: On Evolution and Creationism**

"It seems that creationists really only seek to refute evolution rather than promote their own studies to further explain their beliefs."

I have heard this argument several times now and would like to point out a couple things in relation to it:

First, creation and evolution (in most cases) are mutually exclusive - either design is intelligent or random, either kinds came into existence separately or one kind led to another, either there is a supreme being or there is not.

By strengthening one side, you weaken the other; by weakening one side, you strengthen the other. Creationists maintain that a supreme being created distinct kinds of creatures. The lack of transitional fossil forms SUPPORTS this view as much as it contradicts the evolutionist view. Examples of creatures with "irreducible complexity" (the inability to exist without all the functionality that they currently have) support the creationist view. Anything that defies random existence supports intelligent design. Those are the things that creationists use to further explain their beliefs.

If the evolutionists can argue that creationists simply seek to refute evolution and not to support creation, creationists could do the same thing. Evolutionists often bring up examples of (supposed) transitional forms; from the creationist viewpoint, they are trying to refute creation; from the evolutionist viewpoint, they are trying to support evolution. Because the two views are so fundamentally opposed, it is rare to be able to support one without refuting the other. Thus it will appear to evolutionists that creationists simply try to refute evolution, while in reality they are working to support their view just as much as to refute the alternate.

-Jonathan

---

**Message no. 40**

Posted by **Suheilah Abdalla** on Sunday, February 20, 2005 8:03pm

**Subject: Evolution AND Creationism**

First of all, both theories insist that they are exclusive of the other. The "creationsim" website even goes so far as to say that people who try to merge the two are in a "no man's land".

Also, both theories are beyond proof. In order to believe in each one completely, a great deal of faith is required.

The theories of evolution make sense on a microscopic level, like the natural selection, mutations are probable. However, since the lab. simulations of the atmosphere as it was x billion years ago did not really yield any living organism, I find it hard to believe that life literally originated from thin air.

On the other hand, the Biblical theory of evolution completely discredits the slight chance that speciation could have occurred through evolution. It seems a main problem with them accepting the Evolution theory is that they are unhappy with assuming that Jesus Christ is a "made-over ape". I think that in using this example, they are not doing complete justice to the theory and they are engaging in a sort of emotional blackmail.

I believe there is some middle ground where both theories can co-exist.

---

**Message no. 55**[Branch from no. 40]

Posted by **Cassandra Ashton** on Monday, February 21, 2005 10:27am

**Subject: Re: Evolution AND Creationism**

You and I have the same ideas. Evolution 'works' only after there is something that can evolve. you cant evolve something from nothing. Creationism explains how and why we got here in the past. Evolution is saying were we might end up. 2 completely different directions that if people put aside their differences they might see.  
Cassandra Ashton

**Message no. 66**[Branch from no. 55]Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:43pm**Subject: Re: Evolution AND Creationism**

Again, the belief that evolution CAN happen does not of necessity lead to the conclusion that it DID happen.

---

**Message no. 42**Posted by **Clara Esteban** on Sunday, February 20, 2005 9:30pm**Subject: evolutionary theory v.s scientific creationism**

The evolutionary theory and scientific creationism both explain the diversity of life in different angles, and each one has its own qualities. The difference between evolutionary theory and scientific creationism is that evolutionary theory explains that all life on earth has a common origin, and that all living things share common ancestors. In other words evolutionism consists of the idea that all organisms evolved from a single ancestor. However creationism theory explains the idea that all life was cause to exist at the same time by God, and one way to prove this is by looking in the book of Genesis(the bible). I feel that shortcomings does not exist for both of these theories because both of them explain how life started. Moreover, because in the book of Genesis it quotes that everything God created was perfect, and that it seemed to look good and this is how evolution started. So first came creation than evolution and that's why both theories complement each other.

BY: Clara Esteban

**Message no. 43**Posted by **Jeremy Landquist** on Sunday, February 20, 2005 9:37pm**Subject: Creationism Or Evolution?**

Creationism Or Evolution?

Probably one of the most debated topics since the inception of evolution. Evolution is the scientific theory that changes in a species gene pool have evolved (changed) over time. Whereas creationist believe a spiritual figure (God) created all things from nothing in a six day time period called the creation. These are two very different ideas, so which one is the right one or are either of them right?

Evolution and creationism in my eyes are the same argument just reworded a bit. Each just putting a different spin on the first living things. As I said before creationist believe God created everything from nothing in a six day time period. They believe God has always existed and was not created from or by anything. Now evolutionist believe that we came from a common origin and that the first common origin was created by different chemicals coming together to create it. If you ask an evolutionist where those first chemicals originated from they will tell you that they have just always existed. If that is true then the argument God always existed or chemicals always existed are one in the same the only difference in the origin of both ideas is semantics.

As for me I tend to believe parts of evolution because I think there is substantial evidence that we have evolved and are evolving whether it was from one common origin I'm not to sure. I do firmly believe however that neither of these two ideas can even come close to giving concrete evidence of where origins originated.

---

**Message no. 51**[Branch from no. 43]Posted by **Ashley Rader** on Monday, February 21, 2005 8:36am**Subject: Re: Creationism Or Evolution?**

Hi; I like your essay, and I think you make some good points. However, I do take exception to one of your observations. You say that an evolutionist will tell you that the chemicals for life were always here. They will not make that claim. Instead, they will argue that the Big Bang gave rise to hydrogen atoms which interacted first to form helium, and thereafter all the chemicals of the universe arose in a rather complex way. But you are correct, I think, when you say that creationists will say God has always been here, just as evolutionists will say that all the constituents for the universe have always been here. Neither can be proved or disproved, both are equally plausible, I suppose, but the idea of an omnipresent God who made a perfect universe is hard for me to accept, since all around me I see signs of overwhelming imperfection. What happened?

---

**Message no. 69**[Branch from no. 51]Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:56pm**Subject: Re: Creationism Or Evolution?**

"the idea of an omnipresent God who made a perfect universe is hard for me to accept, since all around me I see signs of overwhelming imperfection. What happened?"

Genesis 3:14-19

When God created man, he gave him a free will - he allowed him to choose

whether he would obey. God created an intelligent spiritual being (the non-flesh-part of man) who would be able to think creatively and make decisions. Had God wanted to, he could have easily made a creature that would have worshipped, loved, and obeyed Him without question, but love without choice is not really love - forced gratitude is not the same as willing gratitude. God has given us the opportunity to decide whether or not we will love, respect, obey, appreciate, and worship him. When we decide to do otherwise, WE are the ones producing the imperfection, not God.

---

**Message no. 67**[Branch from no. 43]

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:49pm

**Subject: Re: Creationism Or Evolution?**

"Evolution and creationism in my eyes are the same argument just reworded a bit."

You make a good point - both views argue that we came from one eternally-existent source. However, there is a fundamental difference between the two views besides this: intelligent design. Evolutionists argue that the development of existence from the common source was random; creationists argue that an intelligent being created it with a plan.

---

**Message no. 44**

Posted by **Ali Tonguc** on Sunday, February 20, 2005 10:24pm

**Subject: evolution theory vs. scientific creation theory**

Even though the both theories discuss the diversity of life they are totally different than each other. Evolutionary theorists believe that all living organisms come from an original organism, and have been developed through generations. That means all organisms have been created from a single ancestor. However scientific creationism theorists believe that God created all the organisms and everything else on earth in six days, and had a pain for this creation as told in the Bible. In my opinion a great amount of faith is required in order to believe these two theories. I tend to believe in evolution theory rather than scientific creationism theory because I think that there is enough evidence that we have evolved and still are.

---

**Message no. 46**

Posted by **Sarah Ball** on Monday, February 21, 2005 1:31am

**Subject: Evolution and Creationism**

Well I just typed up a whole post and pulled a blond moment and lost it, so lets try again...

Evolution and Creationism are two very different theories that have one thing in common, neither of them can conclusively explain where the world we know today came from. Both theories, the religious and the Scientific, rely heavily on followers with a great deal of faith, but where that faith lies is the difference.

The theory of evolution leans on chance. By chance the universe came to be and by chance the environment was perfect, or adapted itself to be, and by chance different living things came to be. And then these things mutated, evolved, and grew to better fit their surroundings. These assumptions are made by looking back at old fossils and comparing similar species, and various other scientific processes that were also founded off of assumption. One unanswered question for me has always been then why are we not seeing seeing species in various stages of evolving now? Why do we not find fossils of these creatures in these stages? And why can we not recreate this process.

Creationism, on the other hand, depends on immense faith. Faith that this planet, solar system, and universe were created by a supreme being with intent, detail, and love. Creationism can be proven even less than Evolution, because how can you conclusively prove that there is a God? Therefore Creationists rely on faith, and disproving the theory of evolution. This theory makes you feel good, but how can it be proven? In evolution one wonders where the matter that everything was created from came from in the first place. Likewise in Creationism, where did God come from? It seems as though in both instances you got something from nothing, and will never be able to completely answer all your questions.

---

**Message no. 52**[Branch from no. 46]

Posted by **Ashley Rader** on Monday, February 21, 2005 8:44am

**Subject: Re: Evolution and Creationism**

Hi, Sarah: I enjoyed your post, but I wanted to respond to one point you made. You ask why we're not seeing species in various stages of evolution? The answer is, we do. Viruses, e.g., the AIDS virus, has been evolving for the thirty or forty-odd years we've been following it. In addition, we see ample evidence of evolution in genetic drift and in the way certain morphologic features, such as upper extremities in dinosaurs, eventually became wings. We can't recreate this process because so far we have been unable to create life. We can clone life forms, but that's not the same as creating them. I think you make some very good points, I agree with you on the question of the origin of God particularly.

---

**Message no. 72**[Branch from no. 52]

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 1:02pm

**Subject: Re: Evolution and Creationism**

Even I agree with micro-evolution - evolution within the species. However, as Sarah pointed out, we don't see any "in-between" KINDS now (e.g. dogs vs. cats vs. frogs), and we don't see them in the fossil record.

---

**Message no. 47**

Posted by **Cathryn Hill** on Monday, February 21, 2005 3:14am

**Subject: big bang or seven days?**

What theory gives the best argument? that we all evolved from different organisms over a course of time through the change in gene frequencies. Or that a higher entity created everything in just a few days. Both views give good arguments for their position, but they are both lacking in scientific evidence. This lack of evidence causes both views to be supported by a great deal of faith. An example of how they are lacking was the example of the fossils. Creationists have said that fossils all came from the same time. The time of the floods. Evolutionists still cannot explain some of the fossils that we have uncovered. There are the missing links in the evolutionary chain.

cathryn hill

---

**Message no. 49**

Posted by **Ashley Rader** on Monday, February 21, 2005 8:13am

**Subject: Evolutionary Theory and Scientific Creationism**

Ashley Rader

PSY-2

Essay 1

EVOLUTIONARY THEORY AND SCIENTIFIC CREATIONISM

The only thing about scientific creationism that is "scientific" is the use of the word in its title. Scientific creationism has virtually nothing in common with evolutionary theory, and although its proponents assert that it is tied to empiricism, it is not. It is faith-based gibberish that is utterly devoid of any supporting evidence or fact. One has only to read what some of its supporters claim to see that it has no scientific foundation. For example, scientific creationists Robert Kofahl and Kelly Segraves assert that it is the believers of evolutionary theory who bear the burden of proof on this issue, while at the same time asserting that those who espouse scientific creationism bear no like burden. This is, on its face, absurd. Kofahl and Segraves make this argument because scientific creationism is a fiction devoid of any empirical proof. If they were to accept the challenge of any burden of proof, their beliefs would collapse, since they are wholly faith-based. Further, Segraves is a notorious fraud who holds no doctorate from any recognized university, and probably has no degree at all. Indeed, the same can be said for many of scientific creationism's most outspoken advocates.

These two men argue that it is the evolutionary theorists who must explain how "dumb, dead atoms transformed themselves into people in just three billion years." First, the world is demonstrably close to 4.5 billion years old--roughly 50% older than Kofahl and Segraves assert. Second, the phrase "dumb, dead atoms" is meaningless, as is the assertion that atoms "transformed" themselves. Atoms interact with other atoms' they are never "transformed." That is a scientific certainty, having been proven perhaps two hundred years ago. No one disputes this fact. Moreover, it is mutation that drives evolution, not "dumb, dead atoms" that "transform themselves."

The evidence that supports evolutionary theory is incredibly strong, if not overwhelming. We see indisputable evidence of this process daily in biochemistry. The AIDS virus, for example, has already demonstrably mutated into several variants of the genesis virus. Indeed, within the last week new victims of AIDS have appeared in New York City whose latency period between exposure to the virus and the onset of full-blown AIDS is measured in weeks rather than years. This demonstrates a profoundly more aggressive form of the virus from the one that first appeared more than three decades ago, and indisputably demonstrates the phenomenon of mutation. The same evidence can be found in bacterial pathogenesis. Common disease-causing bacteria such as staphylococcus and streptococcus have mutated in ways that have rendered them insensitive to even the strongest antibiotics medicine and pharmacology have been able to synthesize. Only evolution can explain this process.

No theoretical science is without its limitations, and evolution is no exception. Critics argue thoughtfully that the mass extinctions of life that the Earth has suffered in the past make it difficult to imagine an evolutionary scheme or scenario that could result in the extraordinary organic diversity that exists on this planet today. However, not all evolutionary theories are Darwinian: endosymbiosis and punctuated equilibrium--each an evolutionary variant of Darwinism--go a long way toward explaining this conundrum.

Scientific creationism is entertaining, much as musing about ghosts and werewolves is entertaining. Yet no one who espouses such views can ever point to a single empirical fact in support of their beliefs. Instead, they revert to sophistry and deceit to make their points. Dr. Kofahl should take a valuable lesson from his affiliation with "Dr." Kelly Segraves: don't. People are judged, at least in part, from their affiliations. Associating with frauds and liars diminishes those who choose such associations.

In a word, evolutionary theory is, indeed, scientifically based; scientific creationism is not. It is rhetoric unsupported by fact, cloaked in misstatements, untruths, and hyperbole. It is unworthy of any serious consideration.

---

**Message no. 54**

Posted by **Cassandra Ashton** on Monday, February 21, 2005 10:22am

**Subject: Creationism vs. evolution**

Although evolution explains how and why we are the way we are today, creationism tries to explain how and why we are what we were to begin with. the creation of the world. I believe both coincide and work together. Neither creationism or evolution can be 'tested' or proven to be truer than the other. Evolution explains that we can from one common ancestor... yea, this is what creationism says to, we decended from God. Evolution doesn't explain how the ancestor came to be, this is where creationism helps to fill in the gaps. When there is neccesity people plants insects and viruses 'evolve' to be able to reproduce and survive in a harsh world. I personally dont believe in God or evolution to the fullest extent, but there is a God and a reason we are here, and we have to have evolved for the population to be as thriving and 'healthy' as it is

---

**Message no. 56**

Posted by **Cole Younger** on Monday, February 21, 2005 10:54am

**Subject: Evolution v Creationism**

Evolution is superior to creationism in the sense that creationism has no evidence to support it, other than the Bible. The biblical evidence is lacking because it was written by a few guys a couple thousand years ago, and who knows what their motives were. "The handy dandy evolution refuter" does not attempt to show evidence of creationism, it only attempts to disprove evolution. Evolution can be observed today. Strains of bacteria that were once susceptible to antibiotics have evolved to strains that are now resistant to antibiotics. The downfall to the theory of evolution is the fact that it is a theory. Science is always changing and susceptible to new ideas and theories which may disprove the previous theories.

Cole Younger

---

**Message no. 57**

Posted by **Regina Huerta** on Monday, February 21, 2005 11:13am

**Subject: Evolutionary Theory and Scientific Creationism**

Approaching these topics from a theoretic and philosophical point of view (as they should be), it is difficult to find exactly where these points "fail" or "prevail." I tend to be somewhat of a scientific mind and go along the notion of evolution. The notions that we evolved and share common ancestors to other animals. I also believe it to be true that you and I are evolving-we are not the same as we were yesterday, a month ago or even a year from now. The question I ask you is: Are those changes due directly from interaction with our environment of from interjection from a higher power: God?

As a believer in a Higher Power this assignment in general posses a round and round we go mind blowing "Where to begin," "What's right, what's wrong"...questions bring forth short answers which lead to MORE questions, and in a weird way I enjoy that. Isn't that what life and evolution is all about. learning. Coming from somewhere to find ourselves somewhere else?- I suppose the short comings to either theory, to any theory is that neither can be proven to be "true," it all comes down to what you believe in based on the evidence found.

Regina.

---

**Message no. 58**

Posted by **Williams Omari** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:02pm

**Subject: GOD or man**

Whom do I put faith in, GOD or man? I have and will always put my faith in the one true creator of all things, GOD. As it was brought out in the webquests readings, that neither scientific evolution or creationism can be proved or disproved so both are lead by faith.

Those scientists and theorists who first developed the theory of evolution are constantly boxing themselves in with contradictions and inconsistencies, such as the observation of unchanged prehistoric lifeforms for periods of millions of years. Animals that have been displaced from their natural environments for decades or even centuries have shown no 'evolutionary' change. However, the thirst for knowledge and understanding for our existence as a sentient human race is inherent in us all and the theory of creationism (or as I would like to put it 'the truths of the bible') puts an accurate depiction and history of 'man' into a real perspective.

---

**Message no. 74**[Branch from no. 58]Posted by **Nicholas Williams** on Monday, February 21, 2005 1:07pm**Subject: Re: GOD or man**

Evolution is NOT based on faith. The fact that it's a scientific theory means that it was tested and tested and tested....science doesn't just stamp its approval on things that have no evidence.

---

**Message no. 61**Posted by **Diane Lacatus** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:33pm**Subject: Evolution and Creationism**

Evolution can be broken down into three basic fundamentals: Mutation, Natural Selection, and Genetic Drift. These basically state that all forms of species were created from other forms of species and that they share a common ancestor. Also that they share a common origin. Creationism on the other hand is based upon religion and faith. It states in Genesis that God is the creator of all species living and dead. He accomplished creation in 6 days in which he created man, woman, animals, and all living organisms.

Some of the shortcomings that both theories share is the fact that evolution nor creationism can be proved as fact through science. Both are based on faith. And faith as we all know can be contradicted. The basis of Creation is theism and evolution is materialism. Which proves that both are religious theories. Each require a leap of faith which leave them both as being "scientific."

---

**Message no. 64**Posted by **James Cunningham** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:40pm**Subject: evolution vs. creation**

The evolutionary theory of existence proposes that every living organism is a descendant of an earlier life form and because of this, every living thing is related through a common ancestor. Through the passing of genes through generations, changes and adaptations in those genes caused a diversity in species. The contrary belief is the more religious based theory of creation. As opposed to the evolutionary theory, creationism believes that God, or a divine being, created the earth and all of its components (including living animals and organisms) in 7 days. This Christian view of things conflicts with the evolution theory more accepted by the scientific minds. Neither can be proven incorrect, but there is scientific evidence indicating that either theory is a possibility. By studying the reproduction and evolution of cells in bacteria and viruses as well as in fossils, scientists have been able to conclude that evolution is prevalent over the course of time. However, missing links such as organisms and animals that seem to have no common traits, favor the creation theory. I personally, being a religious person, believe in the creation theory for the most part. I believe that God created the heavens and Earth and also the living creatures in it. I also believe partly in evolution because of my education. I believe that some of the creatures that exist today are evolutions of original species. In terms of human life, I believe that God created man and woman from man in the beginning. I believe that man has adapted to changes in the world such as climate and geographical location as a means of survival, but for the most part the man we know today is the man that God created in the Genesis.

---

**Message no. 68**Posted by **James Gregory** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:49pm**Subject: Science vs. Not Science**

No faith is required to recognize the process of evolution as the likely means of how different species came to be. Science does not try to prove truth but it tries to extrapolate the probable answer. If the data changes then the probable answer changes. However, scientific creationist only try to find data that proves their unquestionable answer. The theory of evolution in no way tries to disprove the existence of God or the Bible, Koran and Torah as being God's divine word. If the book of genesis was taken as literary as truth than how could spacecraft get past the floodgates of heaven. Evolution's main shortcoming is that it does not adequately address biogenesis. But then again it is the theory of how life changes and not how life began.

---

**Message no. 71**Posted by **Nicholas Williams** on Monday, February 21, 2005 12:59pm**Subject: Evolution vs. Creationism**

It's kind of funny that we open this class with one of the most hotly debated subjects ever.

The evolutionary theory states that every species changes over time, and that consequently all species that exist today originated from a single cell. The intricacies of this theory necessitate a timeline of over a billion years. Creationism, on the other hand,

states that God created all things about 6 thousand years ago (I'm not in the slightest bit sure about that figure ... Christians, help me out here).

Personally, I can't see why anyone who has taken a biology class can even think twice about the validity of evolution. I think someone said something about how we can't be sure that fossils are millions of years old, but maybe they don't know about the way their age is determined. Trace elements in the fossils have certain half-lives (how long it takes for half of a sample of an element to break down), and based on how much of the element is left in the specimen, and what we know about biology, you can get the fossils age nailed down pretty well.

As for there being no proof of evolution ... I can't even begin to fathom this statement. That thing about viruses is just the tip of the iceberg.

However, a shortcoming of the theory of evolution is its inability to explain exactly what happened wayyyyyyy back when the universe began. The general field of science begins to sort of break down when you get to those first moments--physics, biology, evolution, whatever, can't really tell you what happens. Where did the energy come from to create this "big bang"? That's where my mind is open to pretty much anything. But as for anything having to do with earth, you can't tell me that some supreme being created everything, and you especially can't tell me that everything today is pretty much the same as it was when it began.

Experiments have shown that you can generate life in a test tube (not literally a test tube, but this elaborate setup I can't describe perfectly) using organic chemicals. They made life with lava rock, water, and carbon-dioxide-nitrogenic atmosphere.

But you can't really have a discussion about this topic, you're not going to convince anyone of anything.

---

**Message no. 73**

Posted by **Emily Quintana** on Monday, February 21, 2005 1:03pm

**Subject: evolution and creationism**

my post is under test one for some reason

---