

## Compiled Messages

[Download](#)[Close](#)

---

### Message no. 77

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Monday, February 21, 2005 1:41pm

**Subject: RE: Discussion Post 1**

I'm not sure whether we're allowed to continue discussion posts here, but I guess I'll find out. :)

This is in reply to Ashley Rader's main post, which I would have got to if I had another hour or so before cutoff.

She said: "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."

Throughout her post, she critiqued some of the supporters of creationism and offered support for current micro-evolution. I don't necessarily disagree with neither of these points, yet I still support creationism. Creationists believe that a supreme being created distinct kinds of creatures - i.e. macro-evolution did not occur. She offered no argument for macro-evolution HAVING occurred and thus no argument against creationism. However, she then proceeds to say that it is "unworthy of any serious consideration." A theory that fits the facts and has not been disproved is ALWAYS worthy of serious consideration, no matter how absurd it may seem.

She also stated that there are no empirical facts to support creationism. How about irreducible complexity? What about the lack of transitional fossil forms? If we're talking about the lack of objective/agreed-upon-by-all interpretations of facts, show me one that supports evolution and I will show you one that supports creation.

Her comment that "scientific creationism is entertaining, much as musing about ghosts and werewolves is entertaining" serves to poke fun at the creationist viewpoint. Making light of and mocking an opponent's viewpoint in order to convince the listeners is a fallacy, not an argument.

---

### Message no. 82[Branch from no. 77]

Posted by **Nicholas Williams** on Tuesday, February 22, 2005 12:40pm

**Subject: Re: RE: Discussion Post 1**

just out of curiosity, have you taken ANY biology or anthropology classes?

---

### Message no. 85[Branch from no. 82]

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Wednesday, February 23, 2005 11:26pm

**Subject: Re: RE: Discussion Post 1**

In high-school yes, in college, no.

Might I ask why you would ask that, though? I am quite aware of the opinions of both sides, enough to know that neither one can ever conclusively disprove the other and that both can be backed up, refuted,

and then backed up from a different angle.

I come from a heavily creationist background, just as most of you probably come from a heavily evolutionist background. Just as you may think it absurd that I would believe in creation, I originally thought it absurd that so many people would support evolution. Over the years I have begun to develop a better understanding of why evolution makes sense and why creation makes sense, and after evaluating both, I still land firmly on the creationist side.

-Jonathan

---

**Message no. 230**[Branch from no. 77]

Posted by **Jonathan Dautrich** on Sunday, May 8, 2005 1:15am

**Subject: Re: RE: Discussion Post 1**

Just in case anyone is interested, I started reading (listening to via CD actually) a book written by a legal reporter in which he interview several highly credible experts in various fields of science. The book discusses an immense amount of the completely scientific evidence (mostly very recent discoveries) that actually points strongly toward intelligent design. The book is titled "Case for a Creator: A Journalist Investigates Scientific Evidence That Points Toward God" and came out just last year, written by Lee Strobel. If you're open-minded enough to see current materialistic teachings challenged by science itself, I would strongly encourage you to pick up a copy of this book.

-Jonathan

---

**Message no. 232**[Branch from no. 230]

Posted by **Sandra Spears** on Sunday, May 8, 2005 6:33pm

**Subject: Re: RE: Discussion Post 1**

Interesting....

---