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 tring to debate, it is Macro evolution. Natural selection (micro evolution) is nothing more that the modification of certian features with in a specie that alows it to survive better (ex. bird with pointed beek can get to a certian food sort better that one that has a curved stumpy one). Macro evolution on the other had is the change of of one specie to another (ex. ape changes into a man). Unfortunately the problem with both sides is you can't prove either of them scientificly. aka you can't recreate it, observe it now (see God creat it), or
find difinitive 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 descovered) 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 their is no real definitive prove 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.