
Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 09:15:50 GMT

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

Spoony: 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.

JG: I think killing a person for what you've been thought to believe is slightly above eating bugs yes.

Sorry, can you clarify this? I asked which of these two is morally superior, i.e. more commendable in terms of 'rightness'.

1. an ape performing a hygienic service on another (apparently consenting) ape
2. a human killing another human due to nothing more than a disagreement

Your reply doesn't make it clear to me.

Spoony: 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?

JG: Maybe you didn't notice, but I dropped that a while ago.

Indeed I didn't notice, since the post was very recent and since you said absolutely nothing indicating you had dropped it, like admitting you were wrong.

Spoony: 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".

JG: Its made sense to everyone I've asked on IM, your the only one SO FAR having issues with it.

Like I said, no need to be condescending. If you actually read what you typed, you will see that the sentence simply does not make sense. It is apparently incomplete.

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

JG: I can't tell you what to believe.

...babbling again.

Spoony: 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.

JG: Trying defiantly not always succeeding, or going the correct way.

Of course not always succeeding, that's why we're still trying. As for "going the correct way", would you care to fill us in on what "the correct way" is?

Spoony: 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.

JG: Yeah must have missed that one, sorry.

Apology accepted.

Spoony: 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.

JG: Yep

Are you actually agreeing with me here, it's hard to tell.

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

JG: Everything comes from somewhere at some point in time, as I previously said, if you look back far enough, it comes from someplace at some time...

If this is your way of thinking, then how can a god possibly be the answer?

Spoony: 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.

JG: You teach kids a belief when they are in grade school and its likely to be commonly accepted...

Except there is a great deal of evidence supporting the scientific claims. Your statement would be accurate if applied to religion, however.

Spoony: 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.

JG: You posted almost an hour after my last one, and edited my quote times, your thinking to hard...

"You posted almost an hour after my last one"... um, listen to what you're saying. I wasn't necessarily reading your post from the very second you posted it. As for editing your quote times, I simply copy+pasted the quote marks when replying. I'm not aware of the times being mixed up, and so what if they were?

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

JG: Should have read it all first and made just one reply instead a bunch of blocks that are hard to read.

On the contrary, my style of reply makes it very clear which statements respond to which. Yours makes it very difficult. That is besides the point, though.

Spoony: You said they're "just as likely" as each other, and I argued otherwise.

JG: That's what you have come to believe now isn't it.

Yes, that's why I said so and explained why; which you've utterly failed to refute.

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

JG: Whats your point, looks like you agreed to me there.

I do agree with your statement that you "missed a bit". If you think you deserve points for that, then... well, help yourself.

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

JG: I was talking about all the ad hominem.

Specifically?

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

JG: I was pointing out that nothing we said here would make a difference to anyone else, it would be obvious if you hadn't separated that from the rest of my text.
And why do you feel you need the say so?

Spoony: 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.

JG: I didn't say a lot of this but by breaking it into little blocks you destroyed the entire concept and twisted my original point.

It's true that I destroyed your entire concept, but you're a little confused about why. I destroyed your concept by reading what you said, and replying telling you why you were wrong about a great many things. It has nothing to do with the quote structure.

Spoony: Ah. We're back in biblical 'metaphor' time again, are we?

JG: Didn't know I was, you must know more about the bible than I do, good for you!
I was simply referring to the earlier statements about time in a biblical sense. Your own statements were quite similar, e.g. a post that's barely been there a day is "extremely old".

Spoony: Sorry, who's "we"?

JG: Obviously it ended up being no one, give it some thought and you'll realize why ...and we're back to condescending.

JG:I'm not going to be open minded to your points beings your not about mine.
I've actually been very open-minded to your points. That is clearly evidenced by the fact I've read everything you've said and responded to it all. You, on the other hand, have ALREADY demonstrated your closed-mindedness by ignoring most of what I've said, and telling me certain posts of yours are off-limits to discussion. You don't need to tell us "I'm not going to be open minded" when it's clear you never were in the first place.
