
Subject: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [ViolentOrgy](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 18:03:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think if u watch this movie your view on the creation of life on earth will change.

http://www.nwcreation.net/videos/a_question_of_origins.html

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Weirdo](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 19:28:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altough I'm a religious man, I don't really trust this source. I haven't watched the movie completely.

Sentences like this is what made me wonder.

Quote: The Bible is the only holy book in the world that is scientifically accurate. In addition, scientific foreknowledge demonstrates that the Bible is truly the Word of God.

Shouldn't this topic be more for the Hot Topics.

Of Topic: Does anyone know where the quote button is. I had to manually type the quotes.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 19:37:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: This visually rich, full production reveals conclusive evidence that the universe and all life were created by a Supernatural Being, and that the God of the Bible is that Creator.

OMF. LOL WE PROFD GOD EKSISTZ N STUF U EVOLUTINO GUYZ R FAGZ.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 19:42:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Weirdo: Bottom right of your post.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Lijitsu](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 20:14:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Sat, 04 June 2005 14:37Quote: This visually rich, full production reveals

conclusive evidence that the universe and all life were created by a Supernatural Being, and that the God of the Bible is that Creator.

OMF. LOL WE PROFD GOD EKSISTZ N STUF U EVOLUTINO GUYZ R FAGZ.
What did he say? Im normally almost fluent in "Dipshit," but this is a serious case.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 20:16:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm an athiest.

I don't really care about religion, unless it stops the world from continuing on a better course.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 23:24:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am not too big on science, but I know what spontaneous generation is, and saying that life came from a lightning strike and some gas kinda disproves thier agrument.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 23:36:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's just one theory, that everyone plays off of. There can be a number of other ways that Science has yet to find.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 23:55:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

glyde51 wrote on Sat, 04 June 2005 19:06That's just one theory, that everyone plays off of. There can be a number of other ways that Science has yet to find.

Ya I understand that, but since a lot of scientists that I have seen teach it that way, while also teaching how spontaneous generation is not possible kinda makes them hypocrites in my eyes. But anyway, it is only one theory, but it is that one theory that was taught to me as a kid in school.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Weirdo](#) on Sun, 05 Jun 2005 07:18:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 04 June 2005 15:42Weirdo: Bottom right of your post.

I meant the quote button in the reply window. But anyway I found it, . 2nd button on the right.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [almor999](#) on Mon, 06 Jun 2005 22:06:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://drdino.com/searchArticles.php>

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 06 Jun 2005 23:07:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GoArmy44 wrote on Sat, 04 June 2005 19:24I am not too big on science, but I know what spontaneous generation is, and saying that life came from a lightning strike and some gas kinda disproves thier agrument.

So you know, the primordial soup theory and spontaneous generation are two different things.

- Spontaneous Generation is the idea that, for instance, maggots can appear on rotting meat. Francisco Redi disproved this, if you care.

- The primordial soup theory states that chemically-laden soup way back when the earth was quite different was hit by lightning, producing enough amino acids to produce protocells. Amino acids produced by lightning has been proven in laboratory conditions. To be fair, you can make just about anything you want by shocking a chemical liquid with lightning.

On the topic of this movie, I got about 1/6 through it. I've seen all this before. They bend random scientific snippets, like the second law of thermodynamics into having different meanings.

I wonder what Steven Jay Gould thinks of this.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Tue, 07 Jun 2005 01:03:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Mon, 06 June 2005 18:37GoArmy44 wrote on Sat, 04 June 2005 19:24I am not too big on science, but I know what spontaneous generation is, and saying that life came from a lightning strike and some gas kinda disproves thier agrument.

So you know, the primordial soup theory and spontaneous generation are two different things.

- Spontaneous Generation is the idea that, for instance, maggots can appear on rotting meat. Francisco Redi disproved this, if you care.

- The primordial soup theory states that chemically-laden soup way back when the earth was quite different was hit by lightning, producing enough amino acids to produce protocells. Amino acids produced by lightning has been proven in laboratory conditions. To be fair, you can make just about anything you want by shocking a chemical liquid with lightning.

On the topic of this movie, I got about 1/6 through it. I've seen all this before. They bend random scientific snippets, like the second law of thermodynamics into having different meanings.

I wonder what Steven Jay Gould thinks of this.

So, the primordial soup theory says that life comes from non-living substances?

spontaneous generation

n : a hypothetical organic phenomenon by which living organisms are created from nonliving matter [syn: abiogenesis, autogenesis, autogeny]

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 07 Jun 2005 01:15:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Creationism is far more scientifically sound, I'm sure.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 07 Jun 2005 03:56:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Mon, 06 June 2005 19:07GoArmy44 wrote on Sat, 04 June 2005 19:24
am not too big on science, but I know what spontaneous generation is, and saying that life came from a lightning strike and some gas kinda disproves thier agrument.

So you know, the primordial soup theory and spontaneous generation are two different things.

- Spontaneous Generation is the idea that, for instance, maggots can appear on rotting meat. Francisco Redi disproved this, if you care.

- The primordial soup theory states that chemically-laden soup way back when the earth was quite different was hit by lightning, producing enough amino acids to produce protocells. Amino acids produced by lightning has been proven in laboratory conditions. To be fair, you can make just about anything you want by shocking a chemical liquid with lightning.

On the topic of this movie, I got about 1/6 through it. I've seen all this before. They bend random scientific snippets, like the second law of thermodynamics into having different meanings.

I wonder what Steven Jay Gould thinks of this.

Yum Campbell's soup of God jizz. That is scientific twisting right there folks.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 07 Jun 2005 11:53:42 GMT

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

GoArmy44 wrote on Mon, 06 June 2005 21:03So, the primordial soup theory says that life comes from non-living substances?

spontaneous generation

n : a hypothetical organic phenomenon by which living organisms are created from nonliving matter [syn: abiogenesis, autogenesis, autogeny]

You missed the point of what I said. Spontaneous generation is more upon the lines of whole creatures appearing for no reason at all. The primordial soup theory has been proven in laboratories to produce biological chemicals like amino acids that can combine to form growing protocells. And then, over about a billion years time, it's quite likely these protocells turned into you and me.

DarkDemin Yum Campbell's soup of God jizz. That is scientific twisting right there folks.

Did you take Biology as a freshman?

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism

Posted by [ViolentOrgy](#) on Tue, 07 Jun 2005 19:03:32 GMT

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

i did and i thought that the whole soup thing was disproved in the movie and also the creation of

amino acids and such.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 07 Jun 2005 19:37:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's always funny to submit both of these problems to Quantum mechanics. Not only are both possible, but neither can be completely proven.

And yet people fight like silly peons over it.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 00:53:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It did disprove the primordial soup theory. It did a good job proving its case and I've begun to think more on Creationism as far as Science goes. I had always beleived it on a religious sense, but I'm trying to link it in with science now.

"The problem with the big bang theory is this; First there was nothing... Then nothing exploded..."

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 01:39:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gets 'that sinking feeling' that both sides are speaking to each other on completely different wavelengths

Spontaneous generation is NOT the same. Spontaneous generation assumes that a new life form can simply pop into existence. Out of nowhere. With no stimulus for change. Hence the word "spontaneous," which is defined as "Happening or arising without apparent external cause; self-generated." or "Arising from a natural inclination or impulse and not from external incitement or constraint." In other words, Spontaneous generation is when something brings ITSELF into existence, without the assistance of an outside force. Not God, not electrostatic discharge, not a freshly baked pie on grandma's windowsill. Nothing. Something out of nothing, rather.

Primordial Soup is (was) a mass of organic (but not living) matter. BAM! Lightning strikes the Primordial Soup. A reaction occurs, forming more complex proteins out of less complex amino acids (proteins, as we all know, are the building blocks of life- every known living organism has 'em). Over time, these proteins group together. Eventually, DNA pops up. When all is in order, BAM! some other stimulus (presumably a shocking one) causes everything to begin ticking...voila, life.

The two are not one in the same.

The only comment I can think of on that video is that it really doesn't prove anything- it is extremely biased towards one side of the argument, and it was created for the purpose of proving one theory right while proving another wrong (in layman's terms, it has an agenda- you might recognize the filmmaking techniques as ones which are used by a *certain other* filmmaker who claims that his works are *documentaries* ... *cough*MichaelMoore*cough*). It does not use the Scientific Method- if it did, it would gather data THEN draw conclusions. Instead, it draws a conclusion THEN collects data to support it. See the difference?

EDIT Oh shit, I actually agree with SFE...that's a new feeling.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 01:46:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well that's a documentary on Creationism. There's no veiled favor for Creationism... lol You will not see an effective documentary. "The amazing world of Turtles" Starting with the line "Turtles are the most boring creatures on Earth and actually suck a lot..." It was meant to disprove some of the common "facts" about evolution, and try to get some people to believe in Creationism again. OMG MCDONALDS ADS HAVE HIDDEN AGENDA! THEY WANT YOU TO EAT AT MCDONALDS!!! BRAEN WASHENG!!!!!!1!1!11

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [ghostSWT](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 03:06:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No simple video will ever change peoples minds about what theory is right. I personally believe in "Evolution", and the only thing that will convince me about creationism and god is if I see god for my self and he can make some miracles happen just in front of me...

As for all the mathematical probabilities that were in the video so what $1/10^{40}$ is not that bad seeing how many galaxys/stars/planets.... if probability for life was $1/5$ then we would of found it by now but it's not. Also the chances of wining the lottery are let's say $1/10^6$ which is a lot smaller then the chances of life coming from nothing but still people win it all the time. So even if lottery was $1/10^{40}$ after millions of years and billions of people playing it I'm 100% sure someone will win it.

Also I can prove using simple 8th grade math that you can't get from a car to the light pole 10 feet away from the car. Does that make it true or impossible to do? Nope, I'm sure all of you can actually make it 10 feet but mathematically it's impossible. There is a live that connects the car and the pole, the line also has infinite points... Now to get from the car to the pole you have to go threw the $1/2$ way point, then there will be another $1/2$ way point between that and pole, and so on and so on so no mater how close you get to the pole there will be a $1/2$ way point(infinite points on a line). So math can be used to prove some things that are logically NOT true.

And as for all the examples they used saying that evolution is incorrect, just cause we haven't found a way to prove it yet doesn't mean it's not true. Show me 1 scientific example that proves that god created all living things, show me god...

And lastly they said that all the things in the bible are scientific, and that's just crap
<http://members.aol.com/ckbloomfld/bepart13.html> << has some examples of things in the bible that are scientifically untrue and contradictory to what was stated in the movie.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 07:26:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually Ghost that's 100% correct. It's not some flawed 8th grade science as you seem to think. It IS impossible to go anywhere or touch anything. We are always no where and we are always untouced. We never reach, or touch anything. Carbon will back me up on this. You are correct in your statement that you pass the midpoint. But the real thruth is, we never touch a thing, our body is comprised of atoms that just don't touch. Tiny spaces between them. When you pet your dog, the atoms in your hand are getting close to the atoms of the dog, but they never touch. The reason being that the center of anything that exists, IS nonexistant. Spaces smaller than the planck length do not exist. There is an identity for distance known as R or 1/R. When you approach something, and your distance gets infinately small, approaching 1 the planck length. 10, 8, 6, 4, 2, 1, Then it flips and goes 1/.5, 1/.25. Uh oh? What happened? 1/.5 is 2. 1/.25 is 4. You see, as you got closer, you hit the planck length and began to get farther away. This coupled with what I explained earlier. Proves that you really cannot go anywhere, touch anything, or arrive at any destination.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 11:48:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Woah, there's a planck's length? I thought there was only a planck's constant.

Doitle, while we're on the topic, can you be inside something, like an airport? Or arrive at a destination 5x5 foot square? And if there is no distance less than planck's constant, why doesn't putting your finger a planck's constant away from another object count as touching it, since operationally there is nothing there?

Sorry I might not be able to get my tone across right after I wake up, but so you know, I don't mean to be confrontational.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 16:40:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(kinda off-topic, but somewhat related)

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 07 June 2005 21:39

Primordial Soup is (was) a mass of organic (but not living) matter. BAM! Lightning strikes the Primordial Soup. A reaction occurs, forming more complex proteins out of less complex amino acids (proteins, as we all know, are the building blocks of life- every known living organism has 'em). Over time, these proteins group together. Eventually, DNA pops up. When all is in order, BAM! some other stimulus (presumably a shocking one) causes everything to begin ticking...voila, life.

Me in a thread on the RA:APB forums over a year ago more or less about the same topic lly86 @ May 26 2004, 03:21 PM

The guy talkinga bout the lightning being bull crap....
you realize that this has been tried and proven?

when they did it, they got proteins, and so on.

Vladivostok

Started with the basics of proteins being created, then proteins, the advanced proteins, then maybe some living after a long period of time. I believe in that

If I am not mistaken, you both refer to the Oparin-Haldane hypothesis which is basically the primordial soup model of the origin of life. The Miller-Urey experiment set out to test this hypothesis to see if inorganic molecules could actually form organic molecules such as simple sugars and proteins with the addition of heat and electricity. The experiment produced amino acids, fatty acids, hydroxy acids and amide products among a range of organic polymers. No proteins or sugars, though, and this was after a week of running a continuous discharge of 60,000 volts of electricity with the supposed gases of the early Earth atmosphere in a concentrated place. Does a bolt of lightning strike in the same place for a whole week with all the required molecules held in one place during that entire time? If such a process HAD actually occurred, it would have taken billions upon billions of years for the first protein to ever show up! However, the oldest known bacteria fossil is 3.5 billion years old, meaning life was created much earlier than the primordial soup model would allow.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 17:27:05 GMT

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

Quote:No proteins or sugars, though, and this was after a week of running a continuous discharge of 60,000 volts of electricity with the supposed gases of the early Earth atmosphere in a concentrated place.

A lightning bolt can generate around 1 billion volts (at least one or two hundred million volts) of electricity, and produces heat at about 50,000 degrees fahrenheit.

Unless you can find a way to shoot a billion volts through the water then the test is no where near accurate enough.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 21:39:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well Pheonix it's not all that difficult to put out that kind of power. The amount of energy utilized in some of the worlds largest super colliders, are much much much much higher than that.

And to SFE. That is a valid observation. The idea with not being able to "Touch" anything however is the first thing I said, not the planck length. You are correct however that if your a planck length away from something it is like your there since there is no inside. But realistically, at that point you are both there, and infinitely far away... So that observation kinda destroys itself. What I was saying earlier about touching. Is when you feel something, you are feeling the force it's atoms exert on your atoms by way of electronegativity. We don't actually touch anything.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 21:55:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doitle wrote on Wed, 08 June 2005 17:39Well Pheonix it's not all that difficult to put out that kind of power. The amount of energy utilized in some of the worlds largest super colliders, are much much much much higher than that.

I didn't say that we aren't able to create the much energy, I said that a lightning bolt creates much, much more energy then just 60,000 volts, making the experiment very innacurate.

Is it possible to create a discharge of electricty (as in the discharge produced by a tesla coil) powerful enough to match that of a lightning bolt?

(In a super collider, the energy comes from particles colliding at extremely high speeds, right?)

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 22:00:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No the energy comes from superconducting electromagnets which are probably millions of times as powerful as a lightning bolt. lol Supercolliders are absolutely rediculous. I wouldn't be surprised if one day just the Earth lost a big bite out of it because of a accident at one. and the chunk just floated off and the people on it were like... "Oh Shi brb".

I do see your point though. You aren't saying we can't create lightning, your saying the experiment was conducted with less than lightning right?

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 22:15:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah. Using an electrical discharge with about 3,000 to 16,000 times less energy then that of a lightning bolt, to try to prove that lightning can't do something, doesn't work.

That'd be like me trying to prove that bullets can't penetrate skin by shooting my arm with a small airsoft gun.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 22:15:05 GMT

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

1,000,000 x 2,000,000 = 2,000,000,000,000 volts?

That's a lot of power. Are you sure you've got the right number there?

On the topic of power, cool statistic - 10% of all humanity's produced power goes toward nitrogen fixation. Now, who can tell me what nitrogen fixation is used for?

EDIT: This new message board is getting on my nerves.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 22:21:06 GMT

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

Quote:1,000,000 x 2,000,000 = 2,000,000,000,000 volts?

That's a lot of power. Are you sure you've got the right number there?

What are you talking about? Lol, and where did you get those numbers from?

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism

Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2005 23:42:29 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 08 June 2005 18:15Now, who can tell me what nitrogen fixation is used for?

Nitrogen fixation is used to make inorganic atmospheric Nitrogen into organic Nitrogen making Ammonia (NH₃), this is nitrified to Nitrites (NO₂), which can be used as fertilisers but is usually further nitrified to Nitrates (NO₃) which can be absorbed easier by plants so makes better fertilisers. Plants then use the nitrogen to make DNA and Amino Acids, bringing us nicely back to the topic in hand. Were Amino Acids created from the Primordial Soup?

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 09 Jun 2005 01:42:19 GMT

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

Sir Phoenixx wrote on Wed, 08 June 2005 18:21Quote:1,000,000 x 2,000,000 = 2,000,000,000,000 volts?

That's a lot of power. Are you sure you've got the right number there?
What are you talking about? Lol, and where did you get those numbers from?

Doitle said particle accelerators were millions of times as powerful as lightning bolts. I didn't quote his post because you posted when I was typing.

And toolstyle wins the prize.

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Thu, 09 Jun 2005 06:16:35 GMT

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

You underestimate superconducting magnets powered by dedicated power plants. lol

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Thu, 09 Jun 2005 11:37:17 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 08 June 2005 21:42
And toolstyle wins the prize.

What's my prize?

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 09 Jun 2005 11:40:41 GMT

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

My acknowledgement of your correct answer.

[I'd put a winking smilie here if the new forums had winking smilies.]

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Thu, 09 Jun 2005 11:52:01 GMT

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

It does...

Subject: Re: OT: Evolution vs Creationism
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Fri, 10 Jun 2005 21:55:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I miss the old smilies. :cries:

(The ones from the WW Bulletin boards)
