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Is it more reasonable to believe in Creation over Evolution?

by Lenny Esposito

*Letter from Justin:*

*"Before I became a Christian about 2 and a half years ago, I was brought up by society to assume Darwinism is true,*

Justin, actually you were taught in school why evolution is true; because it is the only theory available that fits the observable facts. When you make statements like you just did, you make this letter sound like ... maybe it was written by Lenny himself.

*that living creatures are, as we know of them, the result of random, purposeless evolution ("you can challenge 'religious dogma,' but even think of questioning 'science' and be dismissed as a lunatic." go figure.)*

Actually Justin, until recently you couldn't challenge religious dogma. You should read the story of Galileo. But everyone does in fact challenge science. The ones who do so with evidence are either honored, if successful, or dismissed, if unsuccessful. Those who challenge science without evidence are, as you say ... dismissed as lunatics.

*Then not too long ago, I read some convincing arguments against Darwinism, and I became an Intelligent Designist.*

Justin, education is supposed to be leading you in a positive direction, accumulating knowledge. What you just described was the effect of religion, which always sends you ... in the other direction.

*Heck, recently I read some intriguing arguments in favor of the literal interpretation of Genesis.*

Justin, now you're not just headed in the wrong direction, you're in complete freefall. Hopefully, someone or some thing, will help you pull out of this death spiral before it's too late.

*my point is, I am curious about your stand point on the debate. I know that one could write a novel-sized response to this one, so I do not expect you to dwell on this subject very long unless you are led to."*

*Hi Justin, Thank you for writing.*

*Darwinism is definitely a hot topic today, especially with students and churches. Your letter brings up many issues that I'd like to mention. The most important thing when addressing this or any other issue is to try and approach the discussion in a consistent way. We should be able to examine the evidence for and against it rationally and judge its reasonableness. I really believe there has been too much reaction on an emotional level from both sides and therefore we have not been communicating our position effectively.*

*The best place to start, with any discussion, is by understanding the exact issue that's being discussed. Misunderstandings about the Christian position on evolution are commonplace.*

*First off, when objecting to the idea of Darwinism, we are only discussing a specific type of evolution - macroevolution.*

Lenny, that is because you can't refute change that is occurring right before everyone's eyes as is evident in dog breeding for example. So you are forced to accept evolution. But you try to trick your audience by claiming that there is a second type of evolution. There is not. Macroevolution is simply Microevolution over a longer period of time. So there is simply ... evolution.

*This means that we're talking about life starting spontaneously and from a single organism came every type of living thing we see today - including germs, bugs, animals, fish, and all of the plants too.*

Lenny, the beginning of life is the subject of Abiogenesis not evolution. Evolution has nothing to do with how life started. Which scientist said that life began from a single organism? You can't name one because you lied. No scientist claims that. Organisms are much too complex to have been present at the beginning.

*Not moths changing colors or some such thing.*

See Lenny, that's what I mentioned earlier. Moths changing colors are documented facts that you cannot refute so you are forced to accept evolution. But your religious beliefs preclude you accepting greater changes because that conflicts with your ancient holy scriptures.

*Having different colors or sizes within a species are micro-evolutionary changes and they are not in dispute.*

Lenny, only because you can't dispute what everyone can plainly see.

*More specifically, though, we must remember that Darwinian theory the way its proponents currently assert it is a RANDOM AND PURPOSELESS process.*

Lenny, are you sure you're qualified to debate this subject? Because natural selection is certainly not random. Mutation is random but Darwin knew nothing of mutation. His theory only involved natural selection. How could you not know that?

*That means we must leave out ideas of "theistic evolution" - God causing evolutionary changes to take place. None of the advocates of Darwinism as it is now taught in schools holds to ANY type of creator/designer having any hand in the evolutionary process. I cannot stress this enough. In discussing evolution verses Intelligent Design theory, we must discuss each of those theories the way that their proponents position them. This means evolution is a cosmic accident and nothing more.*

Lenny, you're confusing evolution with abiogenesis again. No biologist considers evolution a cosmic accident. The mechanisms by which it works are well understood by scientists.

*Secondly, we must understand that Darwinism is not an empirical science, but a historical theory based on interpreted evidence.*

No Lenny, you are trying to diminish evolution by redefining it ... incorrectly.

*Many people get caught speechless when someone objects, "How can you doubt evolution to be true? Don't you know that science has proven it to be true?"*

Lenny, I used to get caught speechless. Now I just shake my head in disappointment at how ignorant many modern humans, like you, have become.

*Well, science has not proven evolution to be true.*

Lenny, you are in deep denial. The fact that Ghost Worshippers, like you, refuse to accept science that contradicts your ancient, holy scriptures has no effect on whether or not evolution is true.

*The origin of life is not testable and repeatable like the refraction of light or a chemical reaction. It is primarily a search to find out what happened in a specific point in time in history.*

Lenny, the origin of life is testable. In 1953 Stanley Miller tested his theory that amino acids could spontaneously form without the aid of your invisible ghost, and guess what Lenny ... he was right.

*Much like a forensic investigator who examines clues at a crime scene and tries to put together the events, we are trying to find out what happened for a single occurrence at a specific point in history that is not reproducible. Therefore, we approach the problem by looking at what we CAN examine and make educated guesses as to which processes are the most likely to bring about all of those outcomes. Evolution is simply one idea of what could have happened given all the evidence we have.*

Lenny, now it becomes clear why you keep confusing evolution with abiogenesis. Evolution *is* empirical, testable, and reproducible. Evolution has been documented occurring in the lab as demonstrated by Lenski at Michigan State in 2008. So you deceitfully tried to trick your audience by attempting to conflate evolution with abiogenesis which happened only once, long, long ago. But even that attempt failed because there has been much work done in abiogenesis and not one observation or experiment has indicated that your invisible ghost was involved.

*The question then becomes "is evolution the best explanation of the evidence we have?"*

Lenny, unfortunately for you, evolution is the ONLY explanation we have for the observable evidence.

*In reviewing all the evidence we have currently on evolution, I feel that its explanatory power falls short for the origin of life and great variation of species that have existed throughout time.*

Lenny, we agree it falls short as an explanation for the origin of life because it isn't an explanation for the origin of life ... that's abiogenesis. But it is the only explanation that explains the variation of species throughout time.

*Some of the problems evolution faces are its inability to demonstrate how living organisms began at all,*

Lenny, I think I'm going to puke. You are dumber than a doorknob.

*how the components of the living cell are irreducibly complex*

Lenny, the evolution of irreducibly complex structures is well understood by biologists. I suggest you enroll in a high school level biology class.

*and how the design evident in those organisms argues for a designer.*

Lenny, and what arguments would those be?

*As we look at each of these dilemmas, we can see how evolution fails as an explanatory model. In studying the basic question that evolution attempts to answer, "where did life come from", we see that there is no sustainable model for chemicals coming together and creating a living cell.*

Lenny, can you name one scientist who claims that chemicals came together and created a living cell? No, you can't, because no scientist makes that claim. As the Miller-Urey experiment proved in 1953, chemicals come together to form, not cells, but amino acids - the building blocks of life. From THAT point, evolution begins. Up to that point you're talking about abiogenesis.

*As geologists uncover the true atmosphere of a primitive earth, molecular biologists find that generating amino acids - which produce the proteins needed in all cells for life - becomes incredibly difficult.*

Lenny, if your argument is to fly, you need to show that it is impossible not difficult.

*Further, many scientists see signs that oxygen would have been present in the early atmosphere which would destroy any biological chain reaction creating life.*

Lenny, how would that apply underwater ... where life began?

*In fact, there is no agreed upon model in the scientific community on how cells did come to be.*

Lenny, there is one: evolution.

*Scientists who hold to one theory easily point to obvious flaws in a competing model and visa-versa.*

Lenny, when they "easily point to obvious flaws" in *your* theory, you can add "laughter."

*Another refutation of the evolutionary model that has recently arisen is the idea that cells themselves are comprised of processes that are what as known as "irreducibly complex". In other words, the entire system must exist all at once for it to be of any benefit at all. Michael Behe in his book Darwin's Black Box explains this in greater detail.*

Lenny, if you watch the Nova special on the Intelligent Design Trial in Dover Pennsylvania, you'll see Behe getting his ass handed to him in court. It was brutal.

*He uses a mousetrap as an example. In order for a mousetrap to be of any benefit, it must have some type of base, a spring, a holding wire, a trigger and the hammer that strikes the mouse. Without any one of these components, the trap is completely useless. In the same way, a cell cannot evolve gradually, because all the components that allow a cell to do work must exist simultaneously. Evolving one part but not another is not only useless, but according to evolutionary theory, would put a transitional form at a disadvantage and therefore less likely to survive.*

Lenny, why didn't you use Behe's most famous example: the bacterial flagellum? Why did you use an example of a nonliving object?

Makes me think that maybe you did see that Nova special after all.

*Lastly, the incredible design and purpose shown in the living cell and in the structures that make up living organisms have never been adequately explained by evolution.*

Lenny, unfortunately for you, 99.9% of all biologists ... disagree.

*DNA is a prime example of this. DNA is a digital code made up of only four amino acids.*

No Lenny, it is not a digital code. It is a chemical code.

*As a digital code it provides a blueprint so that all the various mechanisms and forms of life are replicated according to its instruction. The question arises then how could something like DNA be created randomly?*

Lenny, which scientist said it was created randomly? The evolutionary process that led to DNA involved some randomness but most of the processes were guided by physical and chemical laws that were anything but random.

*There is no such thing as a self-generating code*

Lenny, if that claim were true ... you wouldn't be here. Your DNA is constantly repairing itself. You claim an invisible man is doing it. Biologists claim the code is self-generating. Unless you can offer some evidence ... I think I'll go with the scientists.

*for a code is an agreed upon representation of what it's trying to communicate. That's why they're used in espionage; they don't mean anything taken at face value. It is only when someone or something who understands the code based on rules which were prearranged will the true message of the code be known.*

Lenny, espionage codes must be created by humans because they are not alive. Biological codes do not need to be created by humans because they are alive and can self-replicate. Lenny, that is the definition of what it means to be alive.

*Similarly, the idea that several thousands of mutations that happened in the proper sequence are responsible for the flying birds or the eye of a man are, when examined objectively, pure fable.*

Lenny, interesting. Provable scientific fact to you is "pure fable" but your beliefs, such as the talking snake, the opinionated donkey, the sun going backwards, and an unemployed carpenter sprinting across a lake ... are not fables.

You know Lenny, maybe 'interesting' wasn't the right word.

*We never see this type of successive mutation in reality. Even the fossil record shows environmental systems such as the Cambrian explosion appearing abruptly and completely.*

Lenny, you are ignorant even for a Creationist. Even they have to be laughing at the crap you are writing. I'm beginning to wonder why I even took the time.

*Also, the odds for such a delicate balance of all variables required for life to exist is so infinitesimal that holding it happened by accident becomes absurd.*

Lenny, but the sun going backwards ... completely logical.

*So, if all these things are evident, some may ask, why do smart people like scientists keep saying evolution is true and scientifically proven?*

Lenny, because it is. It is morons like you who say otherwise.

*There is good evidence that evolution fails, and so the question then becomes if evolution doesn't work, what other options are there for the existence of life? The evolutionists know the inescapable answer to this question: a Creator.*

Unfortunately for you Lenny, that is not an answer to anything. It is a cop-out for those who have no evidence, but refuse to accept answers that they do not like.

And even if it were proved that a Creator were responsible, you would still have to prove that among all the thousands of invisible ghosts claiming to be responsible ... that it was your spook.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

Human Brains Are Hardwired for Empathy and Friendship

Perhaps one of the most defining features of humanity is our capacity for empathy – the ability to put ourselves in another's shoes. A new study strongly suggests that we are hardwired to empathize because we closely associate people who are close to us – friends, spouses, lovers – with our very selves.

Researchers used functional magnetic resonance imaging brain scans to find that people closely correlate people, to whom they are attached, to themselves. With familiarity, other people become part of ourselves. In other words, our self-identity is largely based on whom we know and empathize with.

Participants underwent fMRI scans of their brains during experiments to monitor brain activity while under threat of receiving mild electrical shocks to themselves, or to a friend, or to a stranger.

Researchers found that regions of the brain responsible for threat response – the anterior insula, putamen and supramarginal gyrus – became active under threat of shock to the self. In the case of the threat of shock to a stranger, the brain in those regions displayed little activity. However when the threat of shock was to a friend, the brain activity of the participant became essentially identical to the activity displayed under threat to the self.

The finding shows the brain’s remarkable capacity to model self to others; that people close to us become a part of ourselves, and that is not just a metaphor or poetry, it’s very real. Literally we are under threat when a friend is under threat. But not so when a stranger is under threat.

This is likely because humans need to have friends and allies whom they can side with and see as being the same as themselves. And as people spend more time together, they become more similar.

It’s essentially a breakdown of self and other; our self comes to include the people we become close to. If a friend is under threat, it becomes the same as if we ourselves are under threat. We can understand the pain or difficulty they may be going through in the same way we understand our own pain.

This is likely the source of empathy, and part of the evolutionary process.

A threat to ourselves is a threat to our resources. Threats can take things away from us. But when we develop friendships, people we can trust and rely on who in essence become we, then our resources are expanded, we gain. Your goal becomes my goal. It’s a part of our survivability.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

FAMOUS QUOTES

ARTHUR C. CLARKE (no biography - previously quoted)

“A faith that cannot survive collision with the truth

is not worth many regrets.”