
Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 05:52:00 GMT

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

Here, just for you spoony.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23 Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 13:26 I refuse to believe that one set of apes evolved to have great intelligence and morals, while the vast majority of apes are still picking each other's butts.

Our morals are no so much greater than apes; they don't kill each other or seek to restrict each others' freedoms for the specific purpose that they think they're commanded to do so by a celestial super-ape. Picking lice off your friends seems like a much more moral, civilised and useful activity.

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 the have the desire to.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wrote I think if 4.5 million 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 million years old, so whether god is real or not, I doubt earth is 4.5 million years old

Billion. 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.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wrote But thats 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.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

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?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wroteBut what I can tell you, is that at some point in time, one of science's most basic laws is WRONG.

You do know what science is, right? Science is our continued understanding of the world, and it develops over time... gradually, just as our understanding of morality does.

Yes Science is made by the understanding of UN PERFECT AND FAR FROM ALL KNOWING HUMANS.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wroteSo, basically we are existing on loaned matter, and I'd hate to be around when it comes time to return said matter
Now you're just babbling.

Shame...

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wroteSo when it comes down to it, I'd rather have a "God" be in control of when all this matter, rather than the alternative none existence randomness that created it, because I'm sure it could just as easily take it away. If one of them was going to take it all away, I'd much rather there be some though fist...

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...

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wroteWas 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.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wroteEvolution - Theory

...supported by a STAGGERING amount of evidence (and do you know what the word 'theory'

even means...?)

Yeah, go back and reread the whole thing...
Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

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

Jerad Gray wroteI 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...

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

See, the event you're thinking of is the wrong one. If you want to put your finger on the origin of life from a creationist viewpoint, the equivalent to the first building blocks of life (which incidentally is not a single cell, nor does the word 'magically' make any sense) is not the creation of stuff by God at all; surely it is the creation OF God. Supposedly God is powerful enough to create a planet and species to live there, he'd be far more advanced than any species we know, or anything that has ever been invented. Doesn't he count as 'life', then? So the real beginning of life isn't God creating the world; it's the creation of God, and nobody's ever come up with a convincing argument as to how, when, or why that supposedly happened.

So let's ask your question again, but replace your fallacious straw-men with more accurate events.

Your thinking too hard and not having nearly enough fun.
Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray probably should have wroteI 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.
Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Jerad Gray wroteIf 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?
Spoony 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...

Also please read previous post after this one.
