
Subject: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [shippo](#) on Thu, 03 Mar 2011 04:28:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do you believe in evolution or creation by intelligent design, and if so why?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 03 Mar 2011 05:05:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

they aren't necessarily mutually exclusive, but evolution is an accepted scientific theory. it has happened, though there are questions about how.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Thu, 03 Mar 2011 05:27:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I believe in Intelligent Design because I have faith in Jeebus Chrysler and his Daddy.

My faith is well placed, don't you worry about that. Fuck science, it's a lot easier to claim the world was created then to investigate and discover how the universe came into being from the ground up; so I'm going with that.

Don't forget to give generously at church, for we could not have pastors living in mansions and driving nice cars without your support.

All praise be to the holiest one. Amen. Hallelujah.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 03 Mar 2011 16:42:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Wed, 02 March 2011 22:05 they aren't necessarily mutually exclusive this

why do they always have to be considered mutually exclusive? why is it so hard to think "hey, maybe we were created by evolution, and there was a lot of skipped time in the Bible... after all, God's sense of time seems to be quite different than ours". But no, religious enthusiasts refuse

progress.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 03 Mar 2011 18:24:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What if God created the big bang?

Suddenly everyone is right!

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [HaTe](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 03:09:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There's more proof (imo) supporting evolution. In my mind it's sort of like Global warming.....it's an accepted scientific fact (by the majority), yet it still has it's skeptics. Though there are many more people believing in god then that who don't believe in global warming...but the point is the same.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [wubwub](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 03:15:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 05:27:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HaTe wrote on Thu, 03 March 2011 22:09There's more proof (imo) supporting evolution. Well, two things. First, factual proof can't be in the form of an opinion. Secondly, no, there is no proof to support evolution. That's why it's called the "Theory of Evolution."

However, various scientific evidence does infer that the theory of evolution is highly plausible. It's just not factually proven so.

Also, funny comic strip.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 16:32:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 03 March 2011 22:27HaTe wrote on Thu, 03 March 2011 22:09There's more proof (imo) supporting evolution.

Well, two things. First, factual proof can't be in the form of an opinion. Secondly, no, there is no proof to support evolution. That's why it's called the "Theory of Evolution."

THERE'S NO PROOF TO INDICATE THAT DINOSAURS EXISTED AT ALL

HAVE YOU EVER SEEN ONE? I THOUGHT NOT! GAME OVER, YOUR DINOSAUR "THEORY" IS PROVEN WRONG ONCE AGAIN!

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 20:22:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Go study anatomy, that will disprove intelligent design...

Apparently, four nerves to innervate the eyeball and surrounding musculature is intelligent...

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 20:26:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 03 March 2011 22:27HaTe wrote on Thu, 03 March 2011 22:09There's more proof (imo) supporting evolution.

Well, two things. First, factual proof can't be in the form of an opinion. Secondly, no, there is no proof to support evolution. That's why it's called the "Theory of Evolution."

However, various scientific evidence does infer that the theory of evolution is highly plausible. It's just not factually proven so.

Also, funny comic strip.

I2science please

The word 'theory' does not at all imply what you think it does.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 21:13:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 03 March 2011 21:27Secondly, no, there is no proof to support evolution. That's why it's called the "Theory of Evolution."

Every time I think I've become acclimated to the bullshit your spew, you go ahead and raise (lower?) the bar. I guess there's no proof to support the Theory of Gravity either? God damn shit popping fucks, you're stupid. >:[

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 22:47:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm under the impression that a "theory" is merely a proposed explanation of some phenomena. It may be agreed upon, but that doesn't change the fact that it is still considered conjecture.

You wouldn't have to theorize something if there is definitive proof of fact that it is indeed the way it works.

Something that is a theory can be changed if there is evidence to support the new development. That's why it's called the theory of evolution; because it isn't definitively proven and a new development can happen at any time that could change our understanding of how it works.

In comparison, and until further factual proof, the theory of a creationist is just as valid as the theory of evolution.

Personally, I believe in evolution if it's any consolation.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [shippo](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 22:59:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 13:22Go study anatomy, that will disprove intelligent design...

Apparently, four nerves to innervate the eyeball and surrounding musculature is intelligent...

lol funny you should say that. (studding anatomy I mean)

Since you brought up the eyeball, the eyeball can focus instantly, capture millions of pictures to send to our brain so we can see movement, sees in color, and cleans its self.

Now a camera or movie recorder can do this as well (except for the cleaning of its self lol) but a camera was defiantly designed for capturing images. Would it not be accurate to assume that the eye was designed for the same purpose?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 23:02:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 14:59CarrierII wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 13:22Go study anatomy, that will disprove intelligent design...

Apparently, four nerves to innervate the eyeball and surrounding musculature is intelligent...

I'm glad you brought that up. Let me respond to you by completely ignoring what you said and flying off on some tangent based on pure speculation. After all, just because the invisible purple flying unicorn is invisible, would it not be accurate to assume that it is also purple?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 23:12:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 15:47I'm under the impression that a "theory" is merely a proposed explanation of some phenomena. It may be agreed upon, but that doesn't change the fact that it is still considered conjecture.

You wouldn't have to theorize something if there is definitive proof of fact that it is indeed the way it works.

Something that is a theory can be changed if there is evidence to support the new development. That's why it's called the theory of evolution; because it isn't definitively proven and a new development can happen at any time that could change our understanding of how it works.

In comparison, and until further factual proof, the theory of a creationist is just as valid as the theory of evolution.

Personally, I believe in evolution if it's any consolation.

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

So no, the idea of creationism is not as valid as the theory of evolution. The idea of creationism is unfalsifiable bullshit.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 23:33:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 14:47 I'm under the impression that a "theory" is merely a proposed explanation of some phenomena. It may be agreed upon, but that doesn't change the fact that it is still considered conjecture.

You wouldn't have to theorize something if there is definitive proof of fact that it is indeed the way it works.

Something that is a theory can be changed if there is evidence to support the new development. That's why it's called the theory of evolution; because it isn't definitively proven and a new development can happen at any time that could change our understanding of how it works.

In comparison, and until further factual proof, the theory of a creationist is just as valid as the theory of evolution.

Personally, I believe in evolution if it's any consolation.

Right before you posted this, Surth told you that "theory" doesn't mean what you think it does. I can only assume that you posted this to give everyone a public example of what "wrong" looks like.

Let me know when they find some factual proof to support Music Theory, or the Theory of Gravity. It'd be nice if all that stuff could move beyond being just conjecture.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 04 Mar 2011 23:45:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 18:33

Right before you posted this, Surth told you that "theory" doesn't mean what you think it does. I can only assume that you posted this to give everyone a public example of what "wrong" looks like.

Let me know when they find some factual proof to support Music Theory, or the Theory of Gravity. It'd be nice if all that stuff could move beyond being just conjecture.

Right, which is why I second guessed myself when I read what he said about me using the wrong definition of a theory. I then looked up the definition of theory and confirmed what I had thought it to be. That's when I made my second post.

So, yes, I am exemplifying my "wrong" definition of it. Which, apparently, isn't necessarily as "wrong" as you are making it sound. The meaning I put behind the word theory was correct, just not under the context used in this thread.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 05 Mar 2011 01:35:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

do you realize not a single person wants you to keep posting here? go away

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Sat, 05 Mar 2011 04:30:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 15:59CarrierII wrote on Fri, 04 March 2011 13:22Go study anatomy, that will disprove intelligent design...

Apparently, four nerves to innervate the eyeball and surrounding musculature is intelligent...

lol funny you should say that. (studding anatomy I mean)

Since you brought up the eyeball, the eyeball can focus instantly, capture millions of pictures to send to our brain so we can see movement, sees in color, and cleans its self.

Now a camera or movie recorder can do this as well (except for the cleaning of its self lol) but a camera was defiantly designed for capturing images. Would it not be accurate to assume that the eye was designed for the same purpose?

@WubWub funny commic

So your argument is: A Camera was designed and has a use. The human eye has a use, therefore it was designed.

Do you realize how bad of an argument this is? I would type an accompanying explanation as to why it is bad, yet as Dover pointed out - you either can't comprehend what somebody is saying to you, or just completely skirt the main points or the entire argument itself and give some half-assed reply supporting your PoV.

Who am I kidding, you probably won't even read this.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [shippo](#) on Sat, 05 Mar 2011 15:01:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

@ snpr and dover

I was trying to get accross the idea that it is easier to believe in the the idea that someing is

created with a purpose as to something just randmoly coming together, especially with something as complicated as the eye.

According to evolution, in order for a genetic trait to be caried over from one animal to another, it must exhibit some sort of benifit to that animal that allows it to survive better than those who do not have it. (this is very closely related to Natural selection)

now with my eye example. the eye is made up of many parts that all must be there together for the eye to work. You need an optic nerve to cary the light to the brain for interpretation, you need a lense to focus the light, you need atleast rods to see in black and white, you need the ciliary muscles that control the amount of light into and out of the eye, and may more.

now, if you had the lense but not the ciliary muscle, you could not focuse on things or zoom in or out.(this is assuming you were lucky in developing an optic nerve and a retina both at the same time) Also this is assuming your brain has the ability to interpret vission. Now anyone care to give me the odds of geting all of this together at the same time? and that is just the eye

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [wubwub](#) on Sat, 05 Mar 2011 16:18:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

When you work out, it creates tiny rips in your muscles that heal over time. When you keep working out, the rips heal over and over again eventually making the muscle bigger to adapt to your lifestyle i.e. working out.

I beleive that with use over long periods of time, you can adapt anything. Wether it takes a couple of weeks or millions of years.

So yes, i beleive in evolution, not this bullshit about design...

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 05 Mar 2011 21:03:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Sat, 05 March 2011 07:01@ snpr and dover

I was trying to get accross the idea that it is easier to believe in the the idea that someing is created with a purpose as to something just randmoly coming together, especially with something as complicated as the eye.

According to evolution, in order for a genetic trait to be caried over from one animal to another, it must exhibit some sort of benifit to that animal that allows it to survive better than those who do not have it. (this is very closely related to Natural selection)

now with my eye example. the eye is made up of many parts that all must be there together for the eye to work. You need an optic nerve to carry the light to the brain for interpretation, you need a lense to focus the light, you need atleast rods to see in black and white, you need the ciliary muscles that control the amount of light into and out of the eye, and may more.

now, if you had the lense but not the ciliary muscle, you could not focus on things or zoom in or out.(this is assuming you were lucky in developing an optic nerve and a retina both at the same time) Also this is assuming your brain has the ability to interpret vission. Now anyone care to give me the odds of geting all of this together at the same time? and that is just the eye

So you're entire argument is "But it's so unlikely!?" You said it yourself, natural selection. You don't see the overwhelming odds of failure because most creatures without working eyes would be extinct at their species' formative period. It's not that unlikely at all. It would only take one or two beings with any given trait to pass it on, especially if it's something as undeniably advantageous as having the ability to see.

You know, I bet that if you put some effort into it, you could probably trace the development of the eye through the fossil record. Human knowledge has sort of gotten past the point of "I don't believe it! What are the odds?!"

Basically, even though it might be easier to believe that something was created with a purpose, it doesn't make it any less wrong to believe that. For proof, consider that the eye took eons to reach the state that it is in now, and if it were designed with purpose it would be much more efficient to do it all at once rather than leave the designer's work to the whims of fate. There are too many risks for an intelligent designer to take; A lucky predator or natural disaster at the wrong moment.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 05 Mar 2011 21:47:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Eyes evolved from much more primitive light sensing organs, which many simpler organisms still have because their other senses are adequate to their purposes... whereas the creatures we evolved from came to rely more on what became eyes.

Proof of evolution is all over the human body- our tailbone (which very rarely manifests as a vestigial tail), body hair, and... can I get a drumroll here?

...nipples.

Why nipples? I'm not talking about male nipples here; those are leftovers from the womb when the fetus becomes one sex instead of the other (or in some very rare cases both or neither). What I'm talking about are vestigial nipples... a second or even a third set located below the proper nipples on the torso. They manifest as little spots, and are sometimes mistaken for warts or moles... not

everybody even has them.

These are an evolutionary atavism- something left over from a much earlier creature that did, in fact, have more than two nipples. They constitute evidence of common ancestry with other mammals such as dogs, cats, cows, etc.

And here you thought there was no way to pass looking at nipples off as science.

Earth has been around for a stupendously long time. There has been life on Earth for a stupendously long time. Human life spans are measured in decades; we do not find it easy to comprehend the concept of billions of years and we do not have the ability to observe the changes in our world beyond our own lifetime. Evolution sounds inconceivably crazy because you've failed to take into account just how much time life has had to evolve.

Most mutations are dead ends. The creatures that receive them are either shunned by others of their species or weakened in some way and their genes are never passed on. However, statistical probability guarantees that some mutations will be passed on... so much time passes for so many generations of so many different organisms and you're bound to see significant, noticeable changes. That's evolution.

We are the product of millions upon millions, possibly even billions of generations starting with a single cell and culminating in what we are today. Not one feature of our bodies just suddenly popped in one generation and stuck around. The slightest of changes, even a single cell's difference at a time, over so much time- first a simple organ to sense the presence of light. Next the ability to determine which direction the light is coming from. Then the ability to sense changes in light intensity. Then simple pattern recognition, resulting in the ability to recognize shapes. Then color recognition, beginning with black and white and ultimately including the entire spectrum... perhaps another few hundred thousand generations or so will yield the ability to see infrared and ultraviolet light.

Tiny little changes add up.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [shippo](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 15:23:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sat, 05 March 2011 14:03

So you're entire argument is "But it's so unlikely!"?

That's part of it, but mainly that there are quite a few pieces that must be there all at the same time for it to work, but any one or two piece can't evolve just by its self due to the fact that there must be a valid purpose for it to be there.

Dover wrote on Sat, 05 March 2011 14:03

You said it yourself, natural selection. You don't see the overwhelming odds of failure because most creatures without working eyes would be extinct at their species' formative period. It's not

that unlikely at all. It would only take one or two beings with any given trait to pass it on, especially if it's something as undeniably advantageous as having the ability to see.

note that it is not natural selection (micro evolution) that I am trying to debate, it is Macro evolution. Natural selection (micro evolution) is nothing more than the modification of certain features within a species that allows it to survive better (ex. bird with pointed beak can get to a certain food source better than one that has a curved stumpy one). Macro evolution on the other hand is the change of one species to another (ex. ape changes into a man). Unfortunately the problem with both sides is you can't prove either of them scientifically. aka you can't recreate it, observe it now (see God create it), or find definitive proof of it in the past (missing links).

Dover wrote on Sat, 05 March 2011 14:03

You know, I bet that if you put some effort into it, you could probably trace the development of the eye through the fossil record.

the problem there is there have been no fossils (as of yet, there could be some not yet discovered) to prove this.

Dover wrote on Sat, 05 March 2011 14:03

Basically, even though it might be easier to believe that something was created with a purpose, it doesn't make it any less wrong to believe that. For proof, consider that the eye took eons to reach the state that it is in now, and if it were designed with purpose it would be much more efficient to do it all at once rather than leave the designer's work to the whims of fate. There are too many risks for an intelligent designer to take; A lucky predator or natural disaster at the wrong moment.

I could go with that. I think it was R315r4z0r, made a good comment earlier in the thread saying that there is no real definitive proof for either side. However on the same note I don't believe it wise to teach the Theory of evolution as 100% fact and then say all other ideas or theories are false.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 15:29:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Microevolution>

oh you

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 16:36:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You missed the point entirely, ask any engineer if they'd have designed a camera with 4 different sets of leads (nerves) to control it, they'll say no - because one set can do it just fine. This

disproves that, if a designer exists, they are intelligent. (Unless you now posit that said designer is also a troll, which is unlikely, and requires proof)

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 17:01:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 09:36 Unless you now posit that said designer is also a troll, which is unlikely

I actually think that a 'designer' being a troll is extremely likely, given some of the things it has supposedly commanded people to do, and has done itself.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 19:14:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 09:36 You missed the point entirely, ask any engineer if they'd have designed a camera with 4 different sets of leads (nerves) to control it, they'll say no - because one set can do it just fine. This disproves that, if a designer exists, they are intelligent. (Unless you now posit that said designer is also a troll, which is unlikely, and requires proof)

What rule says something made isn't intelligently made if it's not in its simplest form?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 21:24:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 11:14 CarrierII wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 09:36 You missed the point entirely, ask any engineer if they'd have designed a camera with 4 different sets of leads (nerves) to control it, they'll say no - because one set can do it just fine. This disproves that, if a designer exists, they are intelligent. (Unless you now posit that said designer is also a troll, which is unlikely, and requires proof)

What rule says something made isn't intelligently made if it's not in its simplest form?

Not necessarily simplest, but with thoughtfulness. Having random shit that serves no purpose (Four nerves, just cuz) cobbled together is not intelligent.

You could say that the designer operates on a level of intelligence far beyond our understanding ("God moves in mysterious ways", or whatever), but that's a pretty big supposition without any evidence to support it. To that, you could say it's all a matter of faith. But that's not what the Intelligent Design idea is all about (I almost called it a theory, but that would confuse poor R3)

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 23:27:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have come to the conclusion that Shippo is trolling.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 06 Mar 2011 23:39:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 07:23note that it is not natural selection (micro evolution) that I am trying to debate, it is Macro evolution. Natural selection (micro evolution) is nothing more than the modification of certain features within a species that allows it to survive better (ex. bird with pointed beak can get to a certain food source better than one that has a curved stumpy one). Macro evolution on the other hand is the change of one species to another (ex. ape changes into a man).

I'm not sure I understand the distinction between the two. How are they different if the process is the exact same? Are you saying evolution is only possible within a species, so one breed of dog evolving into another is okay, but a dog evolving into a wolf is not? I don't see your reasoning for putting arbitrary boundaries on a process you apparently agree with. I can drive from home to the store, I can drive from the store to the edge of the city. From the edge of the city I can drive out of town, and from there I can get to San Francisco. The same process that takes me one step can take me the entire way, given enough time. In your mind, why is evolution any different? So if you agree a bird can evolve a different beak to get its food better, wouldn't it make sense that it could also later have a change in wingspan to adapt to new air currents or something, and then grow thicker feathers to adapt in a change in climate, and then adapt new feet for a better kind of tree to nest in? How many of these changes can it take before it goes too far and becomes "macroevolution"?

Your shit just doesn't make any sense. At all.

snpr1101 wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 15:27I have come to the conclusion that Shippo is trolling.

You're probably right. I should have seen it coming really, with him starting a thread like this.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 01:37:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's amusing (and sad) to see Christianity hijack the ID movement in the U.S. The question raised is a very valid one; but from what I see, Christian intrusion and claims by theists that the designer is the "Christian God" (are they out of their minds?) have reduced the entire ID movement to a lame laughingstock. The only people worth talking about Intelligence Design is to agnostics who suspect intelligence interference and are able to accept without compromise both "god" AND "alien civilizations" pending identification.

Otherwise, your average ID advocate (such as OP, sorry mate) are Christian intruders into the Intelligence Design movement who have subverted a beautiful question of human curiosity as to our origins and tarnished it with the dark cloak of a vicious man-made religion.

The original question itself is a dead-end. ID advocates and creationists (huge difference) always reach such dead-ends with the question. And then what? OK, you "believe" we are intelligently designed! Great w00t! You win! Awesome now what? Need a cookie naow?

In all seriousness, what will be your next step? So you are convinced and/or managed to convince others we are intelligently designed. So what's next? What is next? Are you seeing the massive void I am seeing? Or are you completely oblivious to it? Where will you go next from then? What's your next progressive step to get confirmation? And most importantly, how will you deal with the consequences? Please spell it out in writing.

I would wager the next step is to gather as much rationale for the claims...all of which revolve around missing DNA and advanced cellular engineering. Fair enough. And then what? What about the big important questions that would need to be asked?

Who made us then? (citing current gods won't do, what about Ancient Astronauts? Imagine humans going to another planet and dropping off a batch of young humans and cutting off contact. And we show up decades later to find them; what response will we get? Hopefully not a arrow or rock in the head.)

Why exactly did they make us? (to have fun? to mine gold? to kiss their ass to their satisfaction?)

What were their original intentions for their actions? (largescale planetary life experimentation?)

What were their moral standards compared to our own? (considering how barbaric morals were in the past, I would say the moral standard of any Intelligent Designer was shit plus I will add in incompetency and poor forecasting).

What were their expectations for life on earth? (that their creation become powerful enough to kick their asses?)

What was the entire point of them terra-forming Earth (lol) in the first place and engineering life upon it? (were they playing with life?)

Pretty sure many haven't asked themselves these questions; and I am missing many more. Being atheist, I found, is a much more advantageous position to be when in the receiving end of these questions as you don't assume anything. Secondly, atheism (or the humanist stance) prepares us to better defend humanity and our interests to take care of our own.

From what we cleanly gleaned from our recorded history, we used to be barbarians (we still are). Whatever made us, gave no thought about our well-being, loaded us up with shitty morals, ghastly irresponsibility, and in many cases, have exhibited ruthless genocidal tendencies. And if we consider several ancient texts (and take them literally) dating back to ancient Sumer, the so called "gods" used humans to fuel conflict in blatant power-mongerism and pure bloodlust. They were shit and if they showed up again in orbit, need to be killed on sight.

That being said, we are a thousands times better off now than we were then. Firstly, we can think for ourselves, we have a far wider knowledge of our place in the observable Universe, our advanced transportation and communication advances has closely knit our species together that despite our nationalist-tribe-like differences, the potential for a future human unification is now a possibility. Our morals are so much more advanced now and outright superior to what any ancient texts state. And this can only get better. We have come a long way and a good future awaits us as we have realized how vulnerable we are on this planet. Our conscious has expanded and we are a species that no doubt has the stars as our future destinations.

In addition, we have thousands of years of history on this planet. We have made great strides in our journey of self-discovery. We have, firstly, beaten a billion odds of survival by surviving countless natural catastrophes and massive diseases. Of every shit that came flinging our way, we have survived so far despite taking huge losses to both natural disasters and man-made folly. We have learned about the Universe and about ourselves more. We have studied our own bodies quiet well and out of our own ingenuity have increased lifespans and have made life so much easier for ourselves through medicine. We deserve every pat in the back for our accomplishments and we should be extremely proud of accomplishing all these despite the great odds against us when compared to the dangerous brutish lives of our earliest of ancestors.

While we still have barbaric differences and are divided and have plenty of in-fighting, driven by greed and a tyrant infallible thirst for power, we also generally have a self-worth that we ourselves gained all by our own work. We increased our collective "value" as a species and set a standard for life. As such, anything or anyone trying to come in and change shit up and treat us again like slaves just cos they can claim they made us will get a ass kicking war. It's a question of incredible dimensions to our existence; the creationists and ID folks better think about what exactly they are wishing for.

That's the amazing beauty of evolution. It allows for life to flourish where ever the ingredients are present and it also, much to our excitement, adds the unknown factor of our early days; did advanced alien civilizations visit and tamper with Earth and life? As for spirit entities from other dimensions, well we don't know jackshit about them; it's a queer Universe.

Ofcourse, this entire retarded mental exercise wasn't necessary if some of us here have made an effort to understand evolution further.

Finally, someone please tell me why we are obligated to take a stand on this issue? We are still making discoveries, no? Why are we then asked to belong to a group? It comes down to egotism and bandwagons. People want to be right rather than being wrong; this attitude hurts us so much as we get nowhere to the truth. Ordinary folks as ourselves can bicker all we want; atleast the scientific community that drives our quest for discovery are relentless in the pursuit of truth.

We don't have anything to lose by staying vigilant for the answer instead of prematurely jumping to take a side in a divisive debate.

Thousands of years have past since the last time any of those "Ancient Astronauts" (if you choose to give them some credibility) would have appeared and the dumb ancient humans adopted the cargo cult approach. Or we have evolved and have developed our ideas accordingly (most likely);

thousands of religions have come and gone. The leading religion today is embarrassingly changing its own lines because of how ridiculous its dogmatic claims are starting to sound (lol), and it's apparent all of them are wrong. So despite our difference of opinions and stance, we really have only one choice: to find the answer and confirm it and then deal with the consequences of the truth without sacrificing our dignity and self-worth we have earned thru thousands of years of cumulative hard work spanning countless generations.

In a related note, this is why I can never see myself leaving atheism and becoming agnostic cos it will get me absolutely nowhere and I already tried that approach before.

Here's some fun: Can you imagine if the ID folks were right? That some aliens did create us and that the aliens turned out to be highly advanced but downright murderous like the Predators? Being right won't matter for shit then. So I will repeat, be careful what you wish for.

edit: typos

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 01:51:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 18:37I
Otherwise, your average ID advocate (such as OP, sorry mate) are Christian intruders into the Intelligence Design movement who have subverted a beautiful question of human curiosity as to our origins and tarnished it with the dark cloak of a vicious man-made religion.

ID was never really a different movement. It's merely a rebrand of Creationism, albeit trying to claim that evolution was God's plan all along. Religion is adaptable that way. Plus, 'Intelligent Design' sounds all sciencey and legitimate, as opposed to 'Creationism.'

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 04:15:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 18:51Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 18:37I
Otherwise, your average ID advocate (such as OP, sorry mate) are Christian intruders into the Intelligence Design movement who have subverted a beautiful question of human curiosity as to our origins and tarnished it with the dark cloak of a vicious man-made religion.

ID was never really a different movement. It's merely a rebrand of Creationism, albeit trying to claim that evolution was God's plan all along. Religion is adaptable that way. Plus, 'Intelligent Design' sounds all sciencey and legitimate, as opposed to 'Creationism.'

that's extremely disappointing. Years back, I began thinking ID was a seperate group in America that were independent of religion and were approaching the idea from a secular POV. I was Christian at the time but I found it really interesting because it allowed for multiple possibilities for

gods/aliens but most importantly a chance that people of other religions were also right and not simply damned to hell for not being Christian.

I had always felt there were way too much Christian involvement in ID that I felt shouldn't really belong in a secular movement (especially after Ben Stein expelled his rotten crap...pun intended). Sorry to hear that though.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 04:50:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So far, everyone I've met who espouses Intelligent Design wears their religion on their sleeve.

From Wikipedia:

Quote: Intelligent design was developed by a group of American creationists who revised their argument in the creation–evolution controversy to circumvent court rulings such as the United States Supreme Court *Edwards v. Aguillard* ruling, which barred the teaching of "creation science" in public schools as breaching the separation of church and state.

Really, ID is a cynical attempt to get Creationism back into the schools, by trying to portray it as a science.

Aside from its religious overtones, design cannot really be 'intelligent,' as many evolutions are merely due to chance. If it were truly 'intelligent,' humans likely wouldn't have their innate, undesirable tendencies.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 05:50:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 22:50 If it were truly 'intelligent,' humans likely wouldn't have their innate, undesirable tendencies.
we're too fast for evolution

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 13:42:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 18:37
We don't have anything to lose by staying vigilant for the answer instead of prematurely jumping to take a side in a divisive debate.

It makes sense to take this stance on Predator aliens planting humans, but it gets absurd once God is involved.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 14:13:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 07 March 2011 06:42Starbuzzz wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 18:37
We don't have anything to lose by staying vigilant for the answer instead of prematurely jumping to take a side in a divisive debate.

It makes sense to take this stance on Predator aliens planting humans, but it gets absurd once God is involved.

I don't think it does in the least. What do we have to lose (and gain) when it is indeed a "God?" Which "God" do you mean by that? How do you know who that is? If you see "God" as an ambiguous benevolent being that actually cares for humanity, he/she/it has to realize that by hiding, it is not helping humans find the truth. Unless ofcourse you want me to take a leap of faith and make the assumption. The statement holds within the framework of all rational evidence we have now; for a deity to expect anything more isn't fair.

Compared to the Predators though, if a spiritual force shows up, well, we don't have a chance do we? It still raises the same exact questions.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 17:22:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aliens planting humans is just as far detached from scientific evidence as the world being 5000 years old.

We have a much better understanding of our planet's history than of the universe's, so don't you feel silly when giving a definite answer on a force that goes beyond the universe, while at the same time going off on weird, long alien planting tangents?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 18:33:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't believe any of it, ofcourse. That's why I included this bit before:

Starbuzzz wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 18:37Ofcourse, this entire retarded mental exercise wasn't necessary if some of us here have made an effort to understand evolution further.

Eitherway, I am confused as to who among us two is giving a definite answer on the "force that goes beyond the universe?" As for such a force existing as you imply, are you sure you aren't plugging the unknown gaps with "God?"

Honestly, I don't even see a reason to give myself the benefit of the doubt. There are far too many things that we depend on based on pure chance; our survival is outstandingly dependent on the whims of the Universe that I fail to see where the involvement of any super being fits in.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 19:02:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What's retarded is writing an essay about it, since it doesn't help your point vis-a-vis deism.

I have no idea what you're trying to tell me with the rest of your post.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 07 Mar 2011 19:45:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The mental exercise was pointless given the lack of facts supporting aliens. However, I raised some questions that are appropriate, i.e, what will it make us humans if it was found there was a designer? What position will we be in? If there is a "God" then who are we? slaves? equals?

JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 07 March 2011 12:02I have no idea what you're trying to tell me with the rest of your post.

I was replying to this:

JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 07 March 2011 10:22We have a much better understanding of our planet's history than of the universe's, so don't you feel silly when giving a definite answer on a force that goes beyond the universe,

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [shippo](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 00:16:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sun, 06 March 2011 16:39I'm not sure I understand the distinction between the two. How are they different if the process is the exact same? Are you saying evolution is only possible within a species, so one breed of dog evolving into another is okay, but a dog evolving into a wolf is not? I don't see your reasoning for putting arbitrary boundaries on a process you apparently agree with. I can drive from home to the store, I can drive from the store to the edge of

the city. From the edge of the city I can drive out of town, and from there I can get to San Francisco. The same process that takes me one step can take me the entire way, given enough time. In your mind, why is evolution any different? So if you agree a bird can evolve a different beak to get its food better, wouldn't it make sense that it could also later have a change in wingspan to adapt to new air currents or something, and then grow thicker feathers to adapt in a change in climate, and then adapt new feet for a better kind of tree to nest in? How many of these changes can it take before it goes too far and becomes "macroevolution"?

Your shit just doesn't make any sense. At all.

A wolf is the same specie as a dog, they can interbreed.

According to Genetics the animal changes certain features based on what genes it already has not a brand new one.

With the example of the bird, the bird has both a gene for a small beak and a large beak. Let's say the large beak is a dominant gene and the small beak recessive. Now, if for some reason in the environment the birds with small beaks can get to food better, those birds will survive and pass on the recessive gene. The other birds with the dominant gene will die out. The only gene then seen here would be the small beak gene. However no new gene was created.

To get a new gene, a gene must get mutated by either transcription errors or by some sort of viral infection. The statistic for transcription errors is 10-100 million the majority being harmful or non effective. Is it plausible to get a "good" mutation, yes but this takes more faith in my opinion than "creationism"

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 00:45:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Mon, 07 March 2011 17:16 Is it plausible to get a "good" mutation, yes but this takes more faith in my opinion than "creationism"

or more years than you can comprehend

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 01:31:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Mon, 07 March 2011 16:16 A wolf is the same specie as a dog, they can interbreed.

I don't think you understand what the word "species" means. There are plenty of animals that can interbreed. In most cases all it means is that they have the same number of chromosomes and share a (relatively) recent common ancestry.

shippo wrote on Mon, 07 March 2011 16:16 According to Genetics the animal changes certain features based on what genes it already has not a brand new one.

With the example of the bird, the bird has both a gene for a small beak and a large beak. Lets say the large beak is a dominant gene and the small beak recessive. Now, if for some reason in the environment the birds with small beaks can get to food better, those birds will survive and pass on the recessive gene. The other birds with the dominant gene will die out. the only gene then seen here would be the small beak gene. However no new gene was created.

To get an new gene, a gene must get mutated by either transcription errors or by some sort of viral infection. The statistic for transcription errors is 10-100 million the majority being harmful or non effective. Is it plausible to get a "good" mutation, yes but this takes more faith in my opinion than "creationism"

So your problem is you're not comprehending the absurdly long incommunicably vast amount of time that the process takes. It's not a matter of faith, it's a matter of statistics. But I'm going to assume math isn't your strong suit.

A dice is rolled on that 10-100 million chance every time any creature anywhere reproduces another gamete. Multiplied by the number of creatures alive on earth, multiplied by time. How unlikely is it really?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution

Posted by [shippo](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 04:57:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species> specie in most cases = the interbreeding and production of fertil offspring

Dover wrote on Mon, 07 March 2011 18:31

So your problem is you're not comprehending the absurdly long incommunicably vast amount of time that the process takes. It's not a matter of faith, it's a matter of statistics. But I'm going to assume math isn't your strong suit.

A dice is rolled on that 10-100 million chance every time any creature anywhere reproduces another gamete. Multiplied by the number of creatures alive on earth, multiplied by time. How unlikely is it really?

Well I will have to admit that one statistics is not one of my best subjects

still though awful long time.

I would like to ask one question, (know this one is kinda a sore topic) if we did evolve why is it that we have not found many "missing links"? 99% of fossils are of completed animals with no transitions. shouldn't we find more that are inbetween, so to speak?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 08:11:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

at least you accept that we've found some, which is more than most proponents of creationism dare to admit.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 14:53:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If that's what they really are, I wonder why we haven't found more than just "some". You'd think there would be more of fossils in transition than fossils that aren't, yet that ratio is reversed to the extreme.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 15:17:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've yet to hear a plausible alternative. If species don't evolve from other species, that would mean every species that exists now has always existed for Earth's history. Can you imagine puppy dogs dodging volcanic rock in the time of the primordial soup? I wonder how sheep and cows survived being hunted by dinosaurs? Sounds more than a little silly.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 15:17:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The fossil record isn't complete. It is always wrongly assumed (by creationists) that the fossil record we have now is the ultimate complete chain showcasing all life; it isn't. We are missing out on thousands (in the 6 digits most probably) of species that missed being in the fossil record because fossils don't form all the time; only in the best circumstances and only if the lifeform being preserved is suited for being fossilized. For example; a turtle has a much better chance of being fossilized upon death than a butterfly due to the strong structure of the turtle's body.

And so with such a broken fossil record, we are extremely fortunate to have even "some" transitional creatures; there are actually quite a wealth of transitional lifeforms. The ratio isn't reversed to the extreme, it is perfectly even given the circumstances.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 15:21:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:17 I've yet to hear a plausible alternative. If species don't evolve from other species, that would mean every species that exists now has always existed for Earth's history. Can you imagine puppy dogs dodging volcanic rock in the time of the primordial soup? I wonder how sheep and cows survived being hunted by dinosaurs? Sounds more than a little silly.

<http://creationmuseum.org/>

Quote: Children play and dinosaurs roam near Eden's Rivers.

I hope the dinosaurs weren't carnivorous.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 16:40:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:21 <http://creationmuseum.org/>

Funny, my church was planning to take a trip there.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 22:20:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:40 Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:21 <http://creationmuseum.org/>

Funny, my church was planning to take a trip there.

This teaches me quite a bit about your church. Remind me of this whenever I consider taking anything you say seriously.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2011 22:35:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Perfect time to re-post this:

File Attachments

1) [StarbuzzVSGorilla.JPG](#), downloaded 689 times



Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 09 Mar 2011 01:32:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 15:20Altzan wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:40Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:21<http://creationmuseum.org/>

Funny, my church was planning to take a trip there.

This teaches me quite a bit about your church. Remind me of this whenever I consider taking anything you say seriously.

What, that we believe in Creation?
Is that a surprise?

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 09 Mar 2011 04:27:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 17:32Dover wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 15:20Altzan wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:40Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 08:21<http://creationmuseum.org/>

Funny, my church was planning to take a trip there.

This teaches me quite a bit about your church. Remind me of this whenever I consider taking anything you say seriously.

What, that we believe in Creation?
Is that a surprise?

That whatever beliefs you may hold don't necessarily coincide with the laws of reality and common sense at all. I guess that really isn't much of a surprise either, though.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 09 Mar 2011 04:52:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 21:27That whatever beliefs you may hold don't necessarily coincide with the laws of reality and common sense at all. I guess that really isn't much of a surprise either, though.

Oh, so you're assuming we believe everything the museum does simply because we were looking into visiting it.
No surprises there, again.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 09 Mar 2011 05:12:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 20:52Dover wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 21:27That whatever beliefs you may hold don't necessarily coincide with the laws of reality and common sense at all. I guess that really isn't much of a surprise either, though.

Oh, so you're assuming we believe everything the museum does simply because we were looking into visiting it.
No surprises there, again.

The very fact that you consider it a museum speaks volumes. The term "museum" implies a center of culture and learning, both of which are incompatible with childish daydreams like little Eden kids riding dinosaurs.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 09 Mar 2011 05:13:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 22:12Altzan wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 20:52Dover wrote on Tue, 08 March 2011 21:27That whatever beliefs you may hold don't necessarily coincide with the laws of reality and common sense at all. I guess that really isn't much of a surprise either, though.

Oh, so you're assuming we believe everything the museum does simply because we were looking into visiting it.
No surprises there, again.

The very fact that you consider it a museum speaks volumes. The term "museum" implies a center of culture and learning, both of which are incompatible with childish daydreams like little Eden kids riding dinosaurs.

Nah. We call it a museum because they call it a museum.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 01 Apr 2011 02:53:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll believe which ever theory can explain where either:

- A. God(s) came from
- B. All the matter from the big bang came from (and before that, and before that, etc).

Until that point, all the theories have matter coming out of nowhere at some point which is far to "magical" for my liking.

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 01 Apr 2011 11:07:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A Universe from Nothing by Lawrence Krauss

Subject: Re: Intelligent design vs Evolution
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 01 Apr 2011 17:11:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Fri, 01 April 2011 05:07A Universe from Nothing by Lawrence Krauss

Where did the dark energy/dark matter come from? ((Sorry might have missed it, had to kind of

skip though it quick because I've got a class coming up soon)).
