
Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 06:48:00 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 I would never pick lice off my friends, much less eat them, my friends are quite capable of picking them off, and eating them themselves if they have the desire to.

But would you not agree that de-lousing a friend or family member is a bit higher, morally speaking, than killing someone for the sole reason of being the wrong religion? After all, you said we are so much higher, morally and intellectually speaking, than apes, and the one example you chose to support the statement was the whole 'picking' business. Two can play that game.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23
Jerad Gray wrote I think if 4.5 billion years was correct our planet would have screwed itself over thousands of years ago without our help. It seems to be in too good of condition to be 4.5 billion years old, so whether god is real or not, I doubt earth is 4.5 billion years old. Note the 'b'. The world hasn't screwed itself over thousands of times? Are you aware that well over 90% of species that ever existed on this planet have gone extinct? I'm not talking about deforestation or Japanese whaling here, I'm talking about the price of evolution.

Note that I was just thinking about something else, because in my later posts it is billion, but if you were looking ahead I'm sure you would have noticed that.

It does very much seem as though you're overlooking the major point made in the paragraph you're quoting, namely a pretty effective rebuttal to your "I doubt the earth is that old because it's in too good a condition". Don't you think over 90% of species that have ever existed going extinct is noteworthy?

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Spoony wrote Jerad Gray wrote But that's besides the point, has anyone here ever stopped to think how much more sense it would have made if NOTHING (and I mean truly nothing, like space itself (emptiness) not even to exist). In fact, I'm currently stopping to think how much less sense this sentence of yours makes.

Think about it a bit more, it might be beyond you at first.

Easy tiger, no need to be condescending. I was simply pointing out that the sentence does not make linguistic sense. Maybe "think about it a bit more" is a euphemism for "add in your own words to fill in the gaps".

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Spoony wrote Jerad Gray wrote Now, science states that matter cannot be created or destroyed, and yet we do exist, which means at SOME POINT in time matter was created. Science claims that the big bang is where all the matter in the universe was at one point in time, and prior to that... maybe the last universe that collapsed? And what about prior to that... my point is that at some point in time, this was all created, and whether it was in a compact ball of matter, or by a god, a bunch of gods, ect. , I can't tell you. So far so good, especially the last four words.

Glad you liked them, can you tell us, Spooner the all knowing?

I think you've missed the point again; the point is the last four words could have done the job on their own.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Yes Science is made by the understanding of UN PERFECT AND FAR FROM ALL KNOWING HUMANS.

Yes, we don't know everything, which is why we are constantly trying to find out what we currently don't know, by looking at the facts and testing our theories. That's what science is, and it's a bit strange to dismiss the whole thing by pointing out it isn't finished yet.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Spooky wrote You're confusing truth for comfort; it comforts you that God is in charge of everything. I must disagree. Going by the depiction of Yahweh in the Bible, I am comforted by the likelihood of his non-existence. As for when it's all going to be taken away... well, incidentally there are two imminent events on the horizon. Firstly our sun has a limited lifespan. It's probably got a few million years in it left, but it eventually will die, first becoming a red giant. Secondly the universe is expanding faster and faster (a fascinating scientific study in itself) and the Andromeda galaxy is headed directly on a collision course towards ours. Either of these events will spell doom for this planet and everything on it. Finding another planet a fucking long way away seems the only feasible way of preserving anything we know.

So, how much help do you think religion is in this matter? If God put us in this situation, surely he's either appallingly cruel or appallingly incompetent? (Of course, one could easily think the answer is "both" after reading the Bible, but that still doesn't indicate that he exists at all, let alone is responsible for creating anything.)

I'm not going into a belief war...

Well, I didn't particularly want to point out that the idea of a god creating everything is not comforting to me, mainly because it sheds absolutely no light whatsoever on the actual question at hand, but I did at least do you the courtesy of replying to what you said.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Spooky wrote Jerad Gray wrote Was that completely off topic? Possibly... Just Remember the scientific standards...

4.5 Billion - Estimate

...supported by a great deal of evidence

By us all knowing humans once again.

No serious scientist said we are "all-knowing". The fact we don't know everything yet is not in itself a dismissal of anything we think we do know.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Spooky wrote Jerad Gray wrote Matter cannot be Created or Destroyed - Law

Whoah, hold on there buddy. Matter can't be created, so that proves matter was created, therefore proving God exists?

No it proves that a law is wrong at some point in time, you should have kept reading.

Why do you think matter was "created" out of nothing?

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52 Spooky wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wrote I think one living cell magically appearing, multiplying into a multi cell organism after 4.5 billion years is just as likely as god creating a lot of cells in the form of a human....

How can you possibly assess the likelihood of 'god' creating something if you don't know anything

about that 'god'?

Attacking me personally now are we, thats pretty immature...

No, not at all, just pointing out that you offer absolutely no details about this god you're talking about. And yet you seem to think you don't need to in order to claim it's "just as likely" as the more commonly accepted scientific explanations of the origins of life on this planet.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52Your thinking too hard and not having nearly enough fun.

At the risk of sounding nearly as condescending as you do, it doesn't require a great deal of mental exertion to refute your arguments. As for not having enough fun, I do quite enjoy these debates, even when they're really easy.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray probably should have wrotel think the building blocks of organic life forming from inorganic components, which has been conclusively demonstrated in a laboratory, is just as likely as the creation of an enormously powerful entity, that we might call a 'god', capable of making planets and humans.

Just as likely, eh?

Read more of what I've been saying please.

I did read what you said; that's what allowed me to write a reply proving you were talking complete bollocks.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wrotelf I was god, I'd be a dick and purposely create it too look like someone else did it, that way I could later punish people for fun for not taking a hint from the book I left them
And yet you find it comforting!

Yep, because it'd be like me, anyways, where do I say I believe in either theory spooner?
You said they're "just as likely" as each other, and I argued otherwise.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wroteAnd beings neither can LOGICALLY be, they are both EQUALLY possible.
See above.

Maybe I missed a part of this one...

Presumably yes, namely the bit where I argue that they are not equally likely at all.

Jerad Gray wroteSettle down spoony, no reason to start flipping out

Uh, posting calm and civilised remarks in a debate counts as "flipping out" in your eyes?

Jerad Gray wroteits just renegade forums

Yes, the heated debates section... what are you trying to achieve by pointing out such an obvious fact?

Jerad Gray wrotewhat you say here will NEVER make a difference no matter what side your on.
Again, why are you saying this?

Jerad Gray wroteBut its good to know your extremely qualified about both of these topics, I'll make

sure to look you up next time I have a report to do.

I didn't say that. I didn't claim to be highly knowledgeable about either the origins of the cosmos or of evolution. What I did say was that you, almost by your own admission, seem unqualified to take part in any debate at all. This has nothing to do with the big bang or evolution, and simply your bizarre statements as to which posts of yours I am allowed to respond to.

Jerad Gray wroteAlso I consider it extremely old when its 4 of my posts ago
Ah. We're back in biblical 'metaphor' time again, are we?

Jerad Gray wroteand we have already moved past it.
Sorry, who's "we"?
