

Re: Making money from Java

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Cobol/comp.lang.cobol/2005-12/msg00733.html>

- *From:* "Alistair" <alistair@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 13 Dec 2005 06:08:35 -0800
-

Judson McClendon wrote:

- > "Alistair" <alistair@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
- >> Judson McClendon wrote:
- >> With inbreeding there would have been plenty of birth defects.
- >> Inbreeding doesn't just produce six fingers on each hand. Given a
- >> lifespan of 930 years then they could have had huge numbers of
- >> children.
- >
- > Only if there were genetic defects to begin with. If the Bible account is
- > accurate, Adam and Eve would have had none.

Genetic mutations occur naturally over time in all populations (plant or animal). This allows scientists to track population migrations through history. It would not be inconceivable for Adam and Eve to be subject to one or more spontaneously generated mutations during their lifetime (one is possible albeit highly improbable). Such mutations would have probably resulted in cancers.

A more interesting point would be that after 100 years of life the human chromosomes run a little short of telomeres (the non-coding fragments of DNA which tie off the ends of the chromatids). Any lifespan beyond (say) 200 years requires a miracle to extend the length of the telomeres, otherwise the body would not be able to sustain itself through mitosis (cell division).

- >
- >> However, genetic defects in
- >> children are more likely to have been caused by the particular abnormal
- >> genes becoming more common and more likely to be paired in foetuses due
- >> to matings amongst siblings and close relatives in closed communities
- >> rather than to a Biblical flood exposing people to radiation.
- >
- > I'll just mention this briefly, it is far to involved to get into here, but
- > the original language descriptions of creation and the flood can be
- > interpreted as saying that there was a kind of crystalline covering that
- > covered and protected the earth, and that this covering was destroyed at the
- > time of the flood. If this is true, it could explain a lack of radiation
- > caused defects prior to the flood. Also it could explain a higher

Re: Making money from Java

- > atmospheric pressure. Some scientists have surmised that the flying
- > dinosaurs could not have made it off the ground, and that the larger
- > dinosaurs could not have even lived, in today's atmosphere.

Aside from the Bible, what evidence do we have for the crystalline cover, or its' nature? The height of the cover would be important as if it were at the radius of the asteroid belt, there would be no change in pressure nor would it provide any radiation protection.

I remember watching a documentary about the flying pterosaurs (I presume that they are the ones to which you are referring) and the use of a flying model which proved that the pterosaurs were capable of flapping flight (as are bats) although they were primarily gliding and soaring reptiles. I hesitate calling them dinosaurs as that name applies to a small subset of reptiles that may not include pterosaurs. BTW, recent investigations have been able to show how it is that bumble bees can fly.

- >
- >>> But we know there are fossils of sea creatures
- >>> even on mountain tops.
- >>
- >> Most of which pre-date 4000 BC, give or take a few years.
- >
- > By current theory. However, it is my understanding that radiological dating
- > methods can be extremely unreliable, and they rely on a number of
- > assumptions that cannot be proved for ancient times. However, I am no
- > expert.

Clearly. I would trust the veracity of radiological dating before I believed any of the contents of the Bible. When performing dating, scientists calculate margins of error which allow for ranges of dates. 450 million years ago +/- 10 million years is more than accurate enough for most people. The performance of radiological decay is well and accurately documented.

- >
- >>> The Noah Flood did not happen simply by lots of rain,

snip

- >>
- >> I would suggest that this has to be read in the context of the time.
- >> These people did not understand the structure of the earth nor could
- >> they have conceived of the geological processes of which we are aware.
- >
- > Perhaps not, but the Bible clearly describes the process of water
- > evaporating from the seas, being carried by winds, and coming down as rain
- > on the mountains, it says God sits above the sphere (or circle, same Hebrew
- > word) of the earth, and says the earth is "hung upon nothing". Pretty
- > accurate concepts for such ancient times. :-)

Re: Making money from Java

And the ancients, even thereafter, believed in the flat world floating in an ocean held within a bowl on the back of a giant turtle. That does not require hanging the earth on anything. Other ancients believed the earth was spherical and carried on the shoulders of Atlas (who was standing on what?). One wild guess does not make for advanced science and understanding.

>> And what of the (lack of) resemblance of the deposition features? The
>> mud, the poisoned lakes, the accumulation of dead trees? Are these to
>> be found in the Grand Canyon too? I would put it that 6000 years of
>> geological processes are insufficient to have swept that evidence away.
>
> Well, I don't know of any non-petrified wood exposed to the weather lasting
> 6000 years,

Have you ever heard of the worked wooden trees that have survived, often submerged, as part of neolithic features (wood henges, roof supports and even boats). None of these were petrified.

>>> You also see soil layering
>>> in Engineer's Canyon, just as in the Grand Canyon, on a smaller scale.
>>> The
>>> layering was created by laminar flow (air flow in Engineer's Canyon,
>>> probably water flow in the Grand Canyon).
>>
>> I can not comment on any similarities as I am unfamiliar with
>> Engineer's Canyon and have no desire to rectify that deficiency. But
>> one tiny point, it is not flow that creates laminar deposits but rather
>> a lack of flow (hence the fact that deposits deposit).
>>
>> I would agree that air and liquid flows do normally produce similar
>> effects as they are both examples of fluid flows. However, better
>> geologists than myself would be able to discourse at length about the
>> differences.
>
> Civil engineers know much more about erosion and such effects than
> geologists, because they deal with it in a practical sense every day, and
> can get immediate experimental feedback. I think you would enjoy reading a
> book by two men, a PhD in theology and PhD in civil engineering, named "The
> Genesis Flood". The book was written a while back and needs updating, but
> there is a lot of good stuff in there.

I disagree with the whole of the above. I would not enjoy reading the book, I suspect that I would spend much of my time picking holes in it.

>
>>> Try this: half fill a large box with sand and
>>> gravel, level it, fill the box with water, then knock a hole in the side,
>>> and you see the exact same patterns formed on a smaller scale as the
>>> water

Re: Making money from Java

>>> runs off.
>>
>> I don't have the facility to conduct this experiment. You will have to
>> enlighten me. Are you referring to the fact that outwas sands carry
>> further than boulders or are you referring to terminal moraines formed
>> by retreating glaciers. Perhaps you mean conglomerates and breccias (at
>> last I have been able to put my "O" level Geology to some use!)
>
> I'm saying that if you take an ariel photograph of the Grand Canyon area and
> compare it to what the water leaves behind in that box, the similarity is
> stunning.
>

Stunning or not, this is not proof.

>>> Fossils don't form under normal circumstances.
>>
>> Fossils are an inevitability of happenstance. True, you do need the
>> right conditions to exist but given the size of the earth's surface and
>> the length of geologic time periods then they are inevitable. A great
>> proof of God's existance would have been if there were no fossils at
>> all. BTW, the oldest fossils date to around 3.8 billion years ago.
>
> That dating is by extremely indirect means, I think you will have to admit.

Actually, no.

> For nearly 200 years scientists have been working under an a-priori
> assumption of a no-creation, no-flood situation, and all current theories,
> including theories about dating, came out of this situation. Had the same
> evidence been examined with a mindset toward creation and worldwide flood, I
> believe you would be very surprised at how well the evidence would fit.

And there is the nub of it all: the starting point. My mind was poisoned for 11 years as a child while the (UK) state-sanctioned schools fed me a diet of religion. Then I opened my eyes and started to think for myself. After some 37 years I have concluded that the only valid starting point for an enquiring mind is: I. From this it is possible to come to know the universe as it currently stands. If you start with the Bible as your knowledge base then your understanding can not exceed that of Julius Caesar without that you discard substantial chunks of the Bible. For the record, I suspect that a fundamentalist belief in the Koran would be similarly debilitating.

>
>>> Animals die or are
>>> killed, and scavengers scatter the bones. For a fossil to form, the
>>> remains
>>> must be covered almost immediately.
>>
>> Not true. There is evidence on some (partial) fossil skeletons to show

Re: Making money from Java

>> that they have been subject to animal predation and that parts have
>> been scattered. Such evidence includes claw and tooth marks.
>>
>> If the remains are covered immediately (or sooner rather than never)
>> then the corpse may be saved from predators/scavengers but the tendency
>> of a fossil to be formed is unrelated to how long after death that
>> sedimentation covers it.
>
> For an individual bone, perhaps, but not for the entire skeleton. :-)

No, this also covers full skeletons.

>
>>> If you imagine a Great Flood where the ocean floors
>>> rapidly rise, there would be incredibly huge waves flooding over the
>>> continents, sweeping everything in their path up against hills and
>>> mountains, and into valley floors. This process would leave vast piles of
>>> vegetation and animal remains, which would be rapidly covered with silt.
>>
>> And these vast piles would have been discovered by now. Unless, of
>> course, you mean the Burgess Shales?
>
> They have been discovered. We've been mining them as coal for centuries, and
> pumping them up as oil for decades. :-)

My understanding is that coal derives from two sources: peat bogs and swamps. As for oil, that is the accumulation of oilaceous residues from decomposing animal and plant remains accumulating over millennia.

>
>>> My point here is that the actual
>>> evidence we see can be interpreted as consistent with the Bible without
>>> doing damage to more than man's theories.

Only with some serious suspension of disbelief. Otherwise you wouldn't still need the Holy Inquisition ("Nobody expects the Spanish Inquisition").

> However, there is significant evidence that the earth was created
> instantaneously, or nearly so. Have you studied the ubiquitous occurrence
> and condition of the Polonium residues in granite, and thought about how
> they got there? I find the secular explanations for this extremely
> contrived.

Polonium is a product of irradiating Bismuth which yields Bi-210. This subsequently decays to give Polonium. Hydrogen and Helium are formed in the early stages of the formation of the universe. They subsequently form stars where nuclear fusion forms heavier elements (initially Lithium, Beryllium....) up to and including Uranium. Such heavy elements are found on earth as a result of stars going super-nova and spreading their heavy elements throughout the universe. One such heavy

Re: Making money from Java

element, Uranium, readily decays readily into other heavy metals which in turn decay. This leads to the creation of Bismuth which is then irradiated thereby forming Polonium. How more contrived is that as an explanation than that some unseeable, unknowable, unfathomable super-being put it there?

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Richard
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:*

- *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Chuck Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Peter Lacey
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Peter Lacey
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Pete Dashwood
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Pete Dashwood
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Oliver Wong
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Peter Lacey
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Howard Brazee
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Pete Dashwood
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
◇ *From:* Alistair

Re: Making money from Java

- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
 - ◇ From: Judson McClendon
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
 - ◇ From: Alistair
- ◆ **Re: Making money from Java**
 - ◇ From: Judson McClendon

- Prev by Date: **Re: Making money from Java**
- Next by Date: **Re: JPMorgan Chase to strengthen offshoring to India**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Making money from Java**
- Next by thread: **Re: Making money from Java**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**