

---

Subject: Re: The meaning of life?

Posted by [MexPirate](#) on Wed, 25 Apr 2007 16:18:30 GMT

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

---

AoBfrost wrote on Wed, 25 April 2007 08:59 Well, when i meant a science class, I meant more like the choice of which they want to learn of how the earth was made, creation or bigband/evolution, stating it as science class just meant sitting in one rather than the other during the normal class time.

Evolution isnt fully supported like you claim, sure it seems to make sense, but theres always missing species to complete this and that step, such as where are the mising links? No one has ever found one, if one was found, evolution would be more reputable, but i for one just take it as knowledge, but not belief. You cant go back in time for have text to show evolution is real, but the christains and catholics have text in which they believe is true, so like i said, we have evidence of evolution, which may make it true, while christains have their own faith and belief which also adds to show how the world may have been made, I'm not saying "I'm right, your wrong" but I am just stating what i believe is to be true.

You say choosing to belive in religion doesnt mean you must belive it all, but if you truley say your christain/catholic then obviously you do belive everything your religion has to offer you, or else you wouldnt call yourself these things, you'd be more of a person who doesnt belive, yet has family/goes to church that is christain/catholic.

Nice class - God did it, the end. Evolution is infinately more complicated. Also you are forgetting the other options, from your argument any alternative theories (such as flying spaghetti monsterism) should also be taught at schools? Not forgetting that to do that would require more classrooms, teachers and tbh most kids would take the easy option just because they would get 100% on the creationism exam.

What missing links? everything that forms part of the theory of evolution is by it's very nature supported by huge scientific evidence. If you are reffering to the evoloution of humans current evidence suggests that we split off the evoloutionary ladder from chimps/bonobos only around 5 million years ago (so although we are 98-99% genetically similar we are not evolved FROM chimps). There are records of various extinct primates, the one believed to be out closest relative is detailed here: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australopithecus>

Evolution is NOT belief, or else it couldn't be adapted.

You cannot physically go back in time, but you can look at evidence of life in the past and embryology demonstrates evolution - did you know that as an embryo develops it looks the same as all the rest (a ball shaped blastula followed by gastrula - believed to be the form of the earliest multicellular life, other evidence supports this) as the embryo develops it starts to differentiate following evolution as shown:

The most basic animals are on the left, you can see how they are all similar at the ealier stages and that groups of animals (fish, reptiles & birds, mammals) all look similar at the second stage

before developing the diversity brought about by evolution.

A book (however important) written without evidence does not simply become evidence.

Quote:then obviously you do believe everything your religion has to offer you

why obviously - many people consider themselves to be a follower of a religion but choose to make their own mind up on certain things based upon their own experience and evidence.