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**All About God**

**This essay was taken from the web site of "All About God." Since there was no name attached to this essay, I will address my replies to the managing editor, MeLissa Houdmann, as if she had written this.**

**Evolution vs. Creation: the great debate**

***The Evolution vs. Creation debate is often referred to as the "Great Debate."***

**MeLissa, only among Creationists. Among scientists there is no debate. It has long since been settled.**

**It has also been settled politically. Our courts have ruled that Creationism is religious teaching and completely unrelated to science, and will not be taught in our public schools as science.**

***It's the emotion-packed question of "Origins" -- why, how, and where did everything come from?***

**MeLissa, science does not deal in emotion but in provable facts. The only emotion comes from the religious side (the losing side).**

***20th century science has made the compelling discovery that, at some point, the universe began.***

**MeLissa, that is false. Science does not claim to know whether or not anything existed before the Big Bang. Only religious believers make that claim.**

***Both sides of the Great Debate now agree that the universe has not existed eternally.***

**Wrong again Melissa. Christians believe that their God has always existed. So in their minds the Universe has existed eternally. But in the beginning, it only contained their invisible ghost. Then He got lonely, or something, and created all this stuff ... out of nothing.**

***However, this is where the agreement ends. As far as the "why" and "how" of the "origin event," this is where the division and contention begin. There are two basic theories in this Great Debate. The first is the historical default - the Creation Model of Origins.***

**MeLissa, there are many creation models: there are the Hindu, Muslim, Christian, and dozens of others. So there is no "default."**

**All of these models were created by ancient, superstitious, ignorant men who could not have passed a fourth grade achievement test. All of them believed that the sun was circling the Earth. Interesting that you would base your worldview on such learned scholars.**

***This theory maintains that the intricate design permeating all things implies a Designer.***

**MeLissa, for thousands of years the motion of the sun implied that it was circling us. Science doesn't base its conclusions on implications ... but on provable facts.**

***The second theory is the more recent, atheistic explanation - the Evolution Model of Origins.***

**MeLissa, Atheism has nothing to do with evolution. The two are completely unrelated. As proof, ask the billion Catholics and tens of millions of progressive Christians who accept evolution. They will be more than happy to explain to you where your thinking went off the tracks.**

***This theory postulates that the intricate design permeating all things is a product of random chance and excessive time.***

**MeLissa, what is non-random chance?**

**You only listed two items in order to manipulate your audience into rejecting the scientific alternative. You failed to list the most important factors - the laws of physics and chemistry, which together, helped guide the process.**

**Evolution vs. Creation: the contentions**

***Evolution vs. Creation is indeed the Great Debate of our scientific times. In any scientific debate, the theories must be tested according to the evidence.***

**MeLissa, that is why this is not a scientific debate: Creationism has no theory that can be tested and no evidence to support a single claim that it has made.**

***We propose that the burden of evidence should be upon the Evolutionists,***

**MeLissa, the reason you desperately attempt to shift the burden of proof is because ... you have none.**

***since Creation has been the historic and inherent default throughout virtually all cultures and religions until roughly the last 200 years.***

**MeLissa, that is not how logic works. You don't get to decide the burden of proof. Google "logical fallacies" and you will see how it is determined. You will also see that your attempt to shift the burden of proof is one of the logical fallacies. You might also notice the fallacy of "Appeal to Antiquity." That would be the other fallacy you just committed.**

**Science must, by definition, satisfy its burden of proof for the claims it makes. If those burdens have been met - it is science. If they have not - then they remain only hypotheses.**

**Religion has never met its burden of proof for any claim made by any of the world's religions. If one religion ever did - there would no longer be any Atheists ... nor any other religions.**

***Of course, Evolutionists, who view themselves as the only "scientists" in the debate,***

**MeLissa, they view themselves that way because they *are* the only scientists in the debate. "Creation scientists" may work in the field but when they put their unsupported religious beliefs ahead of proven science they are no longer acting as scientists but as biased individuals.**

***insist that the burden of evidence be upon the Creationists.***

**MeLissa, the burden of proof for evolution is on the biologists. They have met that burden of proof which is why 99% of all biologists accept evolution (including a large number of whom are Christians).**

**The burden of proof for Creationism is on the religious to prove their claim that everything was created. That is a burden they have failed to meet for 2,000 years.**

***Evolutionists reason, we cannot see the Creator, we cannot hear the Creator, and we cannot touch, taste or smell the Creator. Therefore, we are unable to test for the Creator with any form of scientific equipment developed thus far.***

**MeLissa, scientists cannot see black holes, they cannot hear black holes, they cannot touch, taste, or smell black holes; yet they are able to test for black holes and have, in fact, proven that they do exist.**

**That is true as well for a myriad of other things in nature. They can find galaxies billions of light years away; they can test for, and deduce, the structure of atoms. No matter how tiny or how far away, science can examine them. But the most powerful, invisible ghost in the Universe remains unseen and unproven.**

**Why is He so shy? What is He afraid of?**

**He used to show up on Earth all the time, until humans started recording things. Now we're lucky to make out his image in a bowl of Rice Crispies.**

***Creationists retort, we cannot see, hear, touch, taste, or smell the human mind. We cannot test for the human mind with any form of scientific equipment developed thus far.***

**MeLissa, you've got to be kidding, right?**

**How could you be so completely ignorant of the entire field of neurobiology? How could you have never stumbled across the huge numbers of studies on the human mind that have explained much of what we experience, and can even pinpoint exactly where in the brain these experiences originate?**

**You couldn't possibly be as ignorant as you are pretending to be.**

***When we run an electroencephalogram, we are measuring salt flow and electrical activity within the human brain. We cannot so much as even locate the human mind.***

**MeLissa, you people thought for thousands of years that it was located in the heart. You weren't even close. Here's a hint: stick a cotton swab in your ear ... you'll be a hell of a lot closer.**

**You assume that the mind is a separate entity. There is no scientific evidence to back up that claim. Scientists have not only located it, but are studying it in great detail.**

**Your idea of studying the mind would be taking a pulse.**

***Yet we watch as human carcasses run about, making order of disorder, conscious decisions according to subconscious criteria. We see the design and complexity that result from the operation of the brain through the invisible realm known as the mind.***

**MeLissa, neuroscience has made that "invisible" realm, quite visible. The EEG you mentioned earlier is one example of how science has allowed us to see the inner workings of things that our eyes cannot see.**

***Thus, we know with certainty that the human mind exists. Therefore, it's absolutely logical for Creationists to postulate the existence of a Creator based upon the same "evidence."***

**MeLissa, how you jumped from the evidence for a mind to the assertion that this is evidence for an invisible ghost is absolutely amazing.**

**If you have ever taken a logic course in your entire life, you have an excellent case for getting your money back; just show them this essay (especially that last part).**

***The design we see all around us came from one, grand concept, and such a concept can only come from a complex Mind.***

**MeLissa, another unprovable assertion (you're racking up quite a few of them).**

**And even if that were true, it still wouldn't prove it was *your* invisible ghost. By the end of the 21st century, Allah is projected to have more fans than your Ghost, so if this comes down to a vote ... you'll lose.**

***Furthermore, the mathematical and physical laws inherent in all things (including, most dramatically, the Laws of Thermodynamics and the Law of Cause and Effect) effectively validate this evidentiary claim.***

**MeLissa, how do the laws of mathematics validate the existence of your God? How do the physical laws validate the existence of your God?**

**And you had better hope that the 2nd law of thermodynamics is wrong because if it is true, then you can kiss that promise of eternal life goodbye.**

**Evolution vs. Creation: origins**

***In the Evolution vs. Creation conflict, Evolutionists do quite well in terms of theoretical science, but fail to find empirical evidence.***

**MeLissa, you have no empirical evidence for any of your beliefs and yet that does not prohibit your acceptance of biblical claims. So why do you now pretend that empirical evidence has any bearing on what you believe?**

**It doesn't. You never needed empirical evidence to form your beliefs and you don't need it to keep them. It is clear that empirical evidence is irrelevant to your beliefs.**

***Evolutionists theorize that the universe, with all that it contains (space, time, matter and energy), exploded from nothing.***

**MeLissa, you should not be so quick to criticize beliefs that you, yourself, hold: your Bible tells you that your invisible ghost created the entire Universe ... from nothing; and you have no problem believing that.**

**Also, when scientists say "nothing" they don't mean it in the same way you do when you use the word nothing. The quantum fluctuations that are hypothesized to have initiated the Big Bang, come into, and go out of existence for brief periods of time. The space where this occurs may appear empty, but it is not empty at the quantum level.**

***This is contrary to the First Law of Thermodynamics.***

**Ironically MeLissa, it is your beliefs that violate the first law of thermodynamics because, as the Bible indicates, your God created the Universe out of nothing.**

**Based on the laws of quantum physics, the Big Bang theory does not violate the first law because the net energy in the Universe is still zero - just as it was at the time of the Big Bang.**

**So both the first and second laws of thermodynamics disprove your most cherished beliefs: creation and eternal life.**

**Personally, I wouldn't try to claim support from laws which actually contradict my position; but that's just the way I roll.**

***Where did space, time, matter and energy come from in the first place?***

**MeLissa, you believe a magic ghost "wished" it all into existence.**

**You pretend to be scientific, but your beliefs prove otherwise. Your beliefs were never based on science but only on the word of ancient goat herders who claimed that an invisible ghost was telling them what to write down.**

**You believe them. Two-thirds of the world does not. And most importantly, as the world becomes ever more educated ... your numbers are crashing.**

***Thus, for Evolutionists, the ultimate question of Origins remains unsolved.***

**MeLissa, we may never "know" the answer to our origin. But science can give us a good idea of what are the likely possibilities.**

**Unfortunately for you, an invisible magic ghost is not one of the options.**

***To complicate the Evolutionary position, this original explosion of everything from nothing is unable to explain all of the complexity and fine-tuning in the universe, including cosmic "voids" and "clumps", retrograde motion of the galaxies, etc.***

**Actually MeLissa, all of those things are explained by scientists rather well. The only people who can't (or won't) understand the explanations are people who are mentally incompetent, and those who are religious fanatics (was that redundant?).**

**And how do you figure that complexity, fine-tuning, voids, clumps, and retrograde galaxies are best explained by an invisible ghost with a magic wand and severe anger management issues?**

**The fact that you do ... proves that science is the last thing on that feeble little mind of yours.**

***Despite numerous problems, this explosion from nothing has been dubbed the "Big Bang" and is the accepted theory among the majority of Evolutionists.***

**MeLissa, that's because it is based on evidence. Against all the evidence of modern science you have no problem believing that everything did in fact come into existence from nothing when a floating spook said "Abra Cadabra!"**

**Why do you even bother to pretend to be scientific? Whom do you think you're fooling? You have the beliefs of a small child. There isn't an ounce of science in any of your beliefs. You are the poster child for the word "delusion."**

***Evolution is a very unique "science."***

**Unfortunately MeLissa, this entire essay has been devoid of any mention of evolution; all you've done is cut-and-paste refuted Creationist arguments about the origin of the Universe. You haven't even discussed abiogenesis; which is what most Creationists usually confuse with evolution. You haven't got a clue what you're talking about. You are nothing more than a parrot with a keyboard.**

***Typically, scientists observe evidentiary data and then formulate their conclusions.***

**MeLissa, that is the exact opposite of the way religion works. You people formulate your conclusions (based on copies of ancient, edited texts) and then selectively choose which evidentiary data fits. Anything that doesn't is discarded.**

***Evolutionists have formulated their conclusion, and now look for the missing data.***

**MeLissa, you are accusing scientists of reaching their conclusions the exact way that you do. You are stating the truth completely backwards. Why?**

**Because everyone knows that religious people start with the answers (the Bible) and then only accept confirming evidence (of which there has never been any) and discard contradictory evidence (which includes all scientific evidence). So in order to distract your audience from that truth, you accuse scientists of your own faults. That is called "projection" MeLissa.**

**You, yourself, in your own statement of faith, have provided the proof that I am correct:**

***"The Bible is the inerrant, inspired Word of God"***

**MeLissa, that proves you already believe you have all the answers and that you are not open to any evidence, no matter how conclusive it may be. That proves you are the one who has formulated your conclusion and will only accept confirming data.**

**In other words MeLissa, by your own written statement - you are screwed.**

**Evolution vs. Creation: complexity**

***The Evolution vs. Creation debate further seeks to solve the riddle of complexity.***

**MeLissa, in science there is no riddle of complexity: it is explained by evolution. For Creationists it is a riddle because they haven't figured out how to make the evidence conform to their Bible.**

***Creationists believe the universe was designed to be complex by an Intelligent Designer. Evolutionists, in their effort to exclude a designer, contend that complexity has developed from simplicity over time.***

**MeLissa, the fact that complexity has developed from simplicity over time has been established by the evidence and has nothing to do with any motive to exclude your invisible ghost.**

**This essay only adds to the evidence that, in the search for truth, science is the only game in town. Religion is as far from the truth as one can possibly get.**

***Evolutionists view time as their solution. However, hard science tells us that time is the enemy of complexity.***

**MeLissa, hard science? Are you kidding again? That is the last thing on Earth that factors in to your beliefs.**

**You did not arrive at your beliefs through reason, logic, or science, and you will not be dissuaded from your beliefs by any of them. You choose belief over science simply because science does not threaten you with eternal torture ... if you don't believe.**

***This fact has been so well documented that it has obtained the stature of a physical law, the "Second Law of Thermodynamics."***

**MeLissa, if you google "second law of thermodynamics" and go to a science web site instead of hanging out on Christian propaganda web sites (you know - sites like yours), you might discover that the law does not say what you think it does.**

**This has been explained to Creationists thousands of times. Their only defense is to put their fingers in their ears and start singing.**

**They don't want to understand it. They have misinterpreted it to fit their beliefs, and even though that misinterpretation has been exposed and explained, they refuse to let go of it ... because it's all they've got.**

**How utterly pathetic and dishonest you people are.**

**Evolution vs. Creation: the resolution**

**MeLissa, it has already been resolved. Your religious fantasies cannot be taught in our science classes any more than astrology can be taught in our astronomy classes.**

**You have lost every court case. You have lost 99.9% of all biologists (of which many are Christians). The only people who stick with you are those who, like you, refuse to admit that their beliefs have been totally trashed by provable science.**

**Maybe "utterly pathetic" was an understatement.**

***Evolution vs. Creation -- Until Evolutionists find the evidence they've sought since the beginning of the modern Evolutionary movement about 150 years ago,***

**MeLissa, your fingers are in your ears again.**

**Like a little kid who has just been told there's no Santa Claus, you refuse to grow up and use your rational mind. Why?**

**Because you are being terrorized by the threats of an invisible, murdering monster who promises to torture you forever if you lose your faith. As long as you believe that - there is no hope ... for you.**

***there is actually no debate at all.***

**MeLissa, you got that right - but not for the reason you think.**

***Creation is the default.***

**MeLissa, only in church. That is why "you people" home school your kids. It is the only way you can hide the truth from them.**

***Evolutionists insist that complexity developed from simplicity despite the contradiction to known physical laws.***

**MeLissa, google "chaos theory" and you might learn that Benoit Mandelbrot proved you wrong decades ago.**

***Moreover, Evolutionists maintain that this simplicity just sprang into existence without any cause at all.***

**MeLissa, that was a straw man argument that demonstrated that you understand nothing of scientific theories on the origin of the Universe. You are nothing more than a Ghost Worshipper pasting debunked arguments on a web site in a desperate attempt to keep your ancient death cult alive.**

***Let's collect the evidence, and then we can start a debate.***

**MeLissa, waste of time.**

**150 years of evidence has gone 100% against your beliefs. Not once has the evidence ever fallen on your side of the argument. There is nothing to debate.**

**If you ever find your first piece of evidence, offer it up and we'll see what happens. So far, every time you've tried that, it has turned out to be a hoax (like the dozens of claims of finding Noah's Ark or the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin).**

**Like I said, the only place where there is a debate is in church. Society has no more interest in your feeble attempts to attack science than it had in your endless debates over how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.**

**You people are totally useless. And you can take that ... any way you want.**

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

**THE SCIENCE SEGMENT**

**Sperm Viability Greatly Reduced in Offspring of Animals Treated With Common Antibiotic Tetracycline**

**Researchers report that male pseudoscorpions treated with the antibiotic tetracycline suffer significantly reduced sperm viability and pass this toxic effect on to their untreated sons. They suggest that a similar effect could occur in humans and other species.**

**This is the first research to show a transgenerational effect of antibiotics. Tetracycline has a significant detrimental effect on male reproductive function and sperm viability of pseudoscorpions - reducing viability by up to 25 percent - and now we know that effect is passed on to the next generation. They didn't see the effect in subsequent generations.**

**The research involved a three-generation study of a small scorpion-like arachnid. To control for genetic influences, in the first generation, brothers and sisters from each of 21 broods were either treated with weekly doses of tetracycline from birth to adulthood or were reared as untreated controls. Subsequent generations were not treated with tetracycline. The antibiotic had no effect on male or female body size, sperm number or female reproduction.**

**Researchers surmise that tetracycline may induce epigenetic changes in male reproductive tissues that may be passed to sons -- changes that do not alter the sequence of DNA but rather alter the way genes are expressed.**

**The broad-spectrum antibiotic tetracycline is commonly used in animal production, antimicrobial therapy, and for curing arthropods infected with bacterial endosymbionts such as Wolbachia. Despite more than six decades of therapeutic and agricultural use that has resulted in the evolution of widespread bacterial resistance, tetracycline is still commonly used as an additive in animal feed and as an accessible antimicrobial therapy in developing countries.**

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

**FAMOUS QUOTES**

**ISAAC ASIMOV (biography previously given)**

**“Anti-intellectualism has been a constant thread**

**winding its way through our political and cultural life,**

**nurtured by the false notion that democracy means**

**that 'my ignorance is just as good as your knowledge'.”**