
Subject: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [reborn](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 07:46:06 GMT

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

The Bible is quite clear when it comes to the age of our planet, and places it at about 6000 years old.

A commonly accepted age amongst scientists places our planet to be at approx 4.5 billion years. If you're Jewish, or even Christian, does this mean you accept that the Earth is 6000 years old, and scientists are always getting it wrong? Or do you accept that the Earth is older then it states in the Bible, but just choose not to think about it?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [mr£ÄŞÄ-z](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 10:33:43 GMT

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

Ehmmmm... everyone just talks Shito i think everyone is wrong, they just try to get Famous etc.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 11:19:31 GMT

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

madrackz wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 04:33Ehmmmm... everyone just talks Shito i think everyone is wrong, they just try to get Famous etc.

This like, totally opened my eyes, dude.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 12:59:42 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 05:19madrackz wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 04:33Ehmmmm... everyone just talks Shito i think everyone is wrong, they just try to get Famous etc.

This like, totally opened my eyes, dude.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 13:11:17 GMT

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

reborn wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 03:46 The Bible is quite clear when it comes to the age of our planet, and places it at about 6000 years old.

A commonly accepted age amongst scientists places our planet to be at approx 4.5 billion years. If you're Jewish, or even Christian, does this mean you accept that the Earth is 6000 years old, and scientists are always getting it wrong? Or do you accept that the Earth is older then it states in the Bible, but just choose not to think about it?

The more general question to ask if they have actually read the bible once.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 14:55:03 GMT

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

My belief is that god was moving incredibly fast, an appreciable percentage of the speed of light. Subsequently what he saw as 7 days was billions of years to a body in a different inertial reference frame. Science and Religion can complement each other quite nicely if you keep an open mind. ;P

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [DeadX07](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 15:02:25 GMT

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

The Bible states that the Earth was made in seven days. In numerous parts of the Bible you will read that to God, a day is like a thousand years (as well as other similar metaphors). So I suppose it is possible that the Earth itself is very old, but mankind has only been existant for the 6000 years. I don't personally believe science and their billion year statistics they always pull out, but who is to say I am right or wrong. Do we really know anything about our own planet or ourselves for that matter? Not really.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 16:16:49 GMT

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

Basic logic and common sense does..

It's totally ridiculous to think that one race of animal: Human, is so awesome as that they have their own place to go to after they die, apart from anything else in the entire universe. It's both highly ridiculous and makes humans look like total selfish, self promoting jerks..

Not just any form of ridiculous, I mean like squirrel cooking bacon ridiculous..

It really boggles the mind how selfish people can be...

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [mr£Ä\\$Ä-z](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 17:07:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Bible is my Toilett Paper.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [dr3w2](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 18:46:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

madrackz wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 11:07The Bible is my Toilett Paper.
to not beleive in something is yours or anyone elses choice and im completely fine with that

even though im sure this statement is untrue and just a statement, to mock and disrespect
someone elses beliefs shows how pathetic you really are

back on topic

I think the real problem right now is there are many things that has been proven by science, but many different things that are "proven" or beleived through religion. Until there's a theory that encapsulates and puts an answer to everything then the idea of who is right and wrong will go on forever.

I think many religious people, aside from the extremist, dont take the bible word for word in a literal aspect. It may say "7 days" or jesus was born X years ago , however i think majority of people don't take it so literal. So when science comes around and says the world is X years old, those people usually easily accept that and maintain a balance in their concience between fact with evidence and belief.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Genesis2001](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 19:21:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

andr3w282 wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 11:46back on topic

I think the real problem right now is there are many things that has been proven by science, but many different things that are "proven" or beleived through religion. Until there's a theory that encapsulates and puts an answer to everything then the idea of who is right and wrong will go on forever.

I think many religious people, aside from the extremist, dont take the bible word for word in a

literal aspect. It may say "7 days" or Jesus was born X years ago, however I think majority of people don't take it so literal. So when science comes around and says the world is X years old, those people usually easily accept that and maintain a balance in their conscience between fact with evidence and belief.

Yea, I agree with that statement.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2009 22:20:27 GMT

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

Does anybody know the actual verse that says the earth is 6,000 years old? Or is that just the total amount of years the people in Jesus' genealogy had lived?

Either way, though, humanity is a lot older than 6 thousand years. DNA evidence indicates that modern humans originated in east Africa about 200,000 years ago.

I'm not an atheist, but at the same time I don't think one should believe that the Bible is absolutely accurate about everything - its authors include a lot of people we don't know much about.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [DeadX07](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 03:20:34 GMT

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

Quote: Either way, though, humanity is a lot older than 6 thousand years. DNA evidence indicates that modern humans originated in east Africa about 200,000 years ago.

That takes into consideration that our science is actually correct though. We could be right, or we could be wrong. We don't "really" know. After all, we created our own science, so how do we know we are right? Food for thought, anyways.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 06:48:08 GMT

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

A lot of people make that misconception. We didn't "make our own science." Science is simply the study of something.

"Our" science is the ability physically and logically prove something using the resources we have. We can then put the facts we find and put them against our units of measurement that we created.

Or to put it another way: We find proof and then interpret it through the use of human measurement.

So it isn't the facts or science behind it that humans created, what humans created was the means to read and record said facts.

For example:

It is a proven scientific fact that you are able to see how old a tree is by counting the rings inside of it. That is something that occurs naturally in nature. However, it was humans that introduced a counting system and a system of time.

We can figure out a tree's age in years by counting its rings. (Two human derived measurement standards.) However, if those standards didn't exist, that doesn't mean trees would stop producing rings inside of them, nor would it mean that those rings would no longer represent one of Earth's rotations around the Sun.

Do you understand what I mean? The science and facts will always be there. They aren't human creation. The only thing that is human creation is the means to interpret those facts.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 08:24:57 GMT

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

fobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible. unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages, nor are they phased by little details like the fact the two accounts of jesus' genealogy in two gospels are so radically different from each other (but then, the gospels manage to contradict each other about every other single major event to do with jesus, so no surprise there)

to answer the general question by reborn: welcome to the way religious people argue compared to the way scientists argue. when scientists look at the evidence and it doesn't tie up to their theory, they adapt the theory or start a new one from scratch. with the religious, the automatic reflex is "oh, it's a metaphor", "i know it says 'days' but it really means something else" etc etc etc. the possibility that the bible is just plain wrong never crosses the mind.

DeadX07 wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 09:02The Bible states that the Earth was made in seven days. In numerous parts of the Bible you will read that to God, a day is like a thousand years (as well as other similar metaphors).
...like so.

DeadX07 wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 09:02So I suppose it is possible that the Earth itself is very old, but mankind has only been existant for the 6000 years.
Except it hasn't, it's more like hundreds of thousands of years since we became distinct from the neanderthals and the cromagnons (sp?). Yahweh, on the other hand, has only 'existed' (and I'm stretching that word to breaking point) for a few thousand years.
God did not create Man. Man created God.

DeadX07 wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 09:02I don't personally believe science and their billion year statistics they always pull out

What do you mean "pull out"? These are conclusions that have been arrived at after studying enormous amounts of evidence, and which are faced by continual scrutiny. If you wanna see a statistic that was "pulled out" of nowhere, go read the Bible.

DeadX07 wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 09:02but who is to say I am right or wrong. Do we really know anything about our own planet or ourselves for that matter? Not really.

We know buckets and buckets and buckets more about the world, the universe and ourselves than we did at the time the Bible was written.

DeadX07 wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 09:02After all, we created our own science, so how do we know we are right?

We didn't "create" science, science is simply the word used for the process of studying the world around us. On the other hand, something we clearly did create is gods. They were a very very primitive version of science.

I'll just repeat a point I made in a few other threads. Now, we know a great deal about the planet; we know the world has fissures in its crust, a turbulent weather system, a molten core that is still cooling. This explains earthquakes and hurricanes and whatnot. We know about bacteria, which goes a long way to explaining most diseases.

When the Bible was written, we didn't know any of this. Therefore we had no real clue why earthquakes and plagues and such happened, so we can perhaps be forgiven for making the best guess we could; "it's the wrath of a celestial super-bully". Why not think that? It was probably the best we could do at the time.

Now, we know better.

Does the point need emphasising? Read the verses about the animals and God supposedly giving man 'dominance' over them. I'll name three examples of animals that are not mentioned absolutely anywhere: bacteria, dinosaurs, and marsupials. Why not? Because the men who wrote the Bible didn't know they existed. Nobody had found a dinosaur skeleton, nobody knew anything about germs, and nobody had a map that featured Australia. What's more, if they did know about bacteria they'd have known that for thousands of years we did not have 'dominance' over them. Indeed, they had dominance over us for thousands of years, a fight in which we are finally, finally turning the tide. No thanks to religion, of course.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 14:50:28 GMT

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

Just because Dinosaurs aren't mentioned as dinosaurs doesn't mean they aren't mentioned. Read Job 40:15-32 and 41:1-26, then Isaiah 27:1. Though the bible may say these are hippos or crocidiles or elephants, realize that some of these animals don't really live up to the expectations. Dinosaurs could be the "Dragons" God was talking about.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 16:42:44 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 28 February 2009 08:50 Just because Dinosaurs aren't mentioned as dinosaurs doesn't mean they aren't mentioned. Read Job 40:15-32 and 41:1-26, then Isaiah 27:1. Though the bible may say these are hippos or crocodiles or elephants, realize that some of these animals don't really live up to the expectations. Dinosaurs could be the "Dragons" God was talking about.

Spoony wrote welcome to the way religious people argue compared to the way scientists argue. when scientists look at the evidence and it doesn't tie up to their theory, they adapt the theory or start a new one from scratch. with the religious, the automatic reflex is "oh, it's a metaphor", "i know it says 'days' but it really means something else" etc etc etc. the possibility that the bible is just plain wrong never crosses the mind.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 21:21:21 GMT

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

Quote:

That takes into consideration that our science is actually correct though. We could be right, or we could be wrong. We don't "really" know. After all, we created our own science, so how do we know we are right? Food for thought, anyways.

I do respect that response, considering science is ever-changing. However, we do have an enormous amount of recorded history that dates back to far more than 6,000 years. To say that the first man was created in 4,000 BC is ignoring an important chunk of ancient history - political history, religious history, art, conflict, survival, etc.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [dr3w2](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 22:19:19 GMT

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

in terms of the argument "we create science"... ive always believed in the idea that the science and math has always existed, and its been up to us to discover it. No one "creates" a theory or formula, they discover it.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 22:36:00 GMT

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

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Sat, 28 February 2009 15:21]Quote:

That takes into consideration that our science is actually correct though. We could be right, or we could be wrong. We don't "really" know. After all, we created our own science, so how do we know we are right? Food for thought, anyways.

I do respect that response, considering science is ever-changing. However, we do have an enormous amount of recorded history that dates back to far more than 6,000 years. To say that the first man was created in 4,000 BC is ignoring an important chunk of ancient history - political history, religious history, art, conflict, survival, etc.

Out of curiosity, what is this history? Is it the mesopotamians or others?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [mr£ÄŞÄ-z](#) on Sat, 28 Feb 2009 23:50:22 GMT

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

Im gonna write a Book and gonna call it The REAL Bible, then i can enjoy my \$100.000.000 for that crap.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 00:59:20 GMT

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

it's pretty obvious to anyone who is capable of logical thinking and at least somewhat intelligent that religion is false and was only created to ease people's minds and to control them. There are so many fallacies in the bible and with the concept of God that it would impossible for me or others to believe. Though you can never totally disapprove the possibility of the clockmaker (deism), the concepts of christianity, islam, and others are most likely false.

the only good thing about religion is that it keeps stupid people from killing each other too often, sometimes, but not too much.

Though that is at least in America, Islamic extremism really throws that out the window.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [mr£ÄŞÄ-z](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 01:57:57 GMT

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

Hey rocko is back :D

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 17:05:35 GMT

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

Quote:

Out of curiosity, what is this history? Is it the mesopotamians or others?

Well for starters, the Sumerians and ancient Egyptian societies date past 6,000 BC at the time of the Agricultural Revolution. That's a minimum of 8,000 years of organized human society. Before that, humans lived in small band societies and tribes of hunters and gatherers.

You've also got the Neolithic period dating back to around 10,000-12,000 BC, as well as other Stone Age periods that go back thousands of more years.

A 6-7 thousand year old humanity would assume that Adam, the first man, lived at around 4,000-5,000 BC, but at this time there were already entire societies being developed in east Africa, the Middle East and South Asia.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 20:53:38 GMT

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

Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [mr£ÄŞÄ-z](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 21:16:23 GMT

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

Stupid Noah crap thats just fake

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 21:46:38 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53
Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.
THATS CONVENIENT

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 23:50:48 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53 Genisis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years. could you sound like any more of a retard LOL

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 03:00:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For anyone that is going to argue that age disproves the bible good luck, think about it, if god made the earth he could have made it LOOK as old as he wanted it too.

Now instead debating science and religion lets debate something that you also can't prove or disprove.

Prove to me we are not all just a part of some advanced sims game. Where we are programmed to think and act real, interact and do other things we consider to be "real." As far as we know ever two hours the computer on which we are playing has its state saved, is shut down, and started up again 5 hours later at which point we continue our actions never knowing anything had happened

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 03:13:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jerad Gray wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 22:00 For anyone that is going to argue that age disproves the bible good luck, think about it, if god made the earth he could have made it LOOK as old as he wanted it too.

Now instead debating science and religion lets debate something that you also can't prove or disprove.

Prove to me we are not all just a part of some advanced sims game. Where we are programmed to think and act real, interact and do other things we consider to be "real." As far as we know ever two hours the computer on which we are playing has its state saved, is shut down, and started up again 5 hours later at which point we continue our actions never knowing anything had happened

Lol I used to have that same thought myself. Except the last time I thought about it was back in like 3rd grade.

Anyway, it would take an extremely high performance computer to handle something like that. Have you ever really looked at your surroundings? That's not just a simple tree in your yard, every crack, every chip on its surface, deviation in its surface texture is unique and has its own story to

tell.

Every small pebble is unique in shape and size and just as well has its own story to tell. How it got there, how long its been there, how old it is since it was created, how it got that little gash on the side of it.

For a computer to hold, store, and present that information in a constant state without flaw or without demanding power needs is simply unimaginable.

Sure, you could say "unimaginable to us." But, seriously now.. why spend that much work on a game that is nothing more than carbon copy of life itself?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 03:20:25 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 20:13Jerad Gray wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 22:00For anyone that is going to argue that age disproves the bible good luck, think about it, if god made the earth he could have made it LOOK as old as he wanted it too.

Now instead debating science and religion lets debate something that you also can't prove or disprove.

Prove to me we are not all just a part of some advanced sims game. Where we are programmed to think and act real, interact and do other things we consider to be "real." As far as we know ever two hours the computer on which we are playing has its state saved, is shut down, and started up again 5 hours later at which point we continue our actions never knowing anything had happened

Lol I used to have that same thought myself. Except the last time I thought about it was back in like 3rd grade.

Anyway, it would take an extremely high performance computer to handle something like that. Have you ever really looked at your surroundings? That's not just a simple tree in your yard, every crack, every chip on its surface, deviation in its surface texture is unique and has its own story to tell.

Every small pebble is unique in shape and size and just as well has its own story to tell. How it got there, how long its been there, how old it is since it was created, how it got that little gash on the side of it.

For a computer to hold, store, and present that information in a constant state without flaw or without demanding power needs is simply unimaginable.

Sure, you could say "unimaginable to us." But, seriously now.. why spend that much work on a game that is nothing more than carbon copy of life itself?

Perhaps its not a carbon copy of life its self, or maybe its a carbon copy of life that long sense died out lol (or even if it was then its just like the sim city/sims games (which I hate because I

personally find them extremely boring).

Any glitches that appeared we would simply either accept to be real, or just think we were seeing things.

And maybe in comparison to a real reality, this is horribly under detailed, we would never know, it would be just like trying to imagine a NEW color to the system of colors we currently know, our minds simply can't do it.

And finally, maybe the game is constantly lagging, and running extremely slow, but we would never know that, as we would never have a sense of external time, as far as we would know, the ten seconds that just happened to us took a day for the computer to generate.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Mighty BOB!](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 05:16:34 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53: Genisis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years. Actually they take that into account already. The figure only gets to about 10,000 years tops.

The bible, or any religious text for that matter, should absolutely not be interpreted literally. Sometimes they have good messages that people should abide by like "Hey don't kill your neighbor or steal his stuff or his wife" but then they also contain "supernatural" things that can easily be explained by modern science, like disease being caused by bacteria, viruses, and unsanitary conditions, as opposed to "the wrath of an omnipotent, omniscient creator-being."

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 15:56:27 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53: Genisis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.
haha

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 18:35:35 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53
Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years. Spoony wrote fobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible. unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 03 Mar 2009 21:31:15 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 11:35
Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53
Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.

Spoony wrote fobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible. unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages Soooo.... anyone have a Bible on them, I'm at school and don't have one on me, someone should count up how many generations there were between Adam and Noah, Noah lived to be extremely old as well if I remember correctly, we should average Noah and Adam together and get a ROUGH estimate of how long people were actually living. Because I seriously doubt that there were only 4 or 5 people born before Noah.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 13:17:16 GMT

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

DeadX07 wrote on Sat, 28 February 2009 02:02
The Bible states that the Earth was made in seven days. In numerous parts of the Bible you will read that to God, a day is like a thousand years (as well as other similar metaphors). So I suppose it is possible that the Earth itself is very old, but mankind has only been existant for the 6000 years. I don't personally believe science and their billion year statistics they always pull out, but who is to say I am right or wrong. Do we really know anything about our own planet or ourselves for that matter? Not really.

calculates

7 times 1000 is 7000...

7000 minus 6000 is... carry the two...

OH MY GOD.

WAIT A MINUTE! THE EARTH IS STILL BEING CREATED BY GOD! BY GEORGE I GOT IT!

He's got 1 more day to do it. Or 1000 more years, for us slow bastards.

Now THATS a theory.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 15:31:12 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 03 March 2009 16:31Spoony wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 11:35Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years. Spoony wrotefobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible. unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages Soooo.... anyone have a Bible on them, I'm at school and don't have one on me, someone should count up how many generations there were between Adam and Noah, Noah lived to be extremely old as well if I remember correctly, we should average Noah and Adam together and get a ROUGH estimate of how long people were actually living. Because I seriously doubt that there were only 4 or 5 people born before Noah.

Even if you said they was working on the idea that the average person only lived 30 years, we can work out how many generations they had it out by doing $6000/30 = 200$.

So even if we said there was 200 generations, and each of them lived for 1000 years, that $200*1000 = 200,000$.

Although 200,000 years is allot more then 6000 years, it's still nowhere near 4.5 billion years.

Even if you said they lived 10,000 years, and only reproduced at the end of there life, then that's still only $200*10,000 = 2$ million years.

Whether the bible points towards an age of 6000 years or 2 million years, it's way off 4.5 billion years. My question remains, do you shrug it off and accept that science is right, and try not to think about this, or do you simply tell yourself that science always gets it wrong, hey, it wasn't that long ago they thought the Earth was flat.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [DeadX07](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 15:51:46 GMT

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

Karandras wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 07:17DeadX07 wrote on Sat, 28 February 2009 02:02The Bible states that the Earth was made in seven days. In numerous parts of the Bible you will read that to God, a day is like a thousand years (as well as other similar metaphors). So I suppose it is possible that the Earth itself is very old, but mankind has only been existant for the

6000 years. I don't personally believe science and their billion year statistics they always pull out, but who is to say I am right or wrong. Do we really know anything about our own planet or ourselves for that matter? Not really.

calculates

7 times 1000 is 7000...

7000 minus 6000 is... carry the two...

OH MY GOD.

WAIT A MINUTE! THE EARTH IS STILL BEING CREATED BY GOD! BY GEORGE I GOT IT!

He's got 1 more day to do it. Or 1000 more years, for us slow bastards.

Now THATS a theory.

Not meant to be taken literally. 1000 years was just an example, as God does not exist in time. Same for the 6000 years, just an example, as I don't know how long humans have really been here since I haven't done the research.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 16:03:03 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Sat, 28 February 2009 02:24 welcome to the way religious people argue compared to the way scientists argue. when scientists look at the evidence and it doesn't tie up to their theory, they adapt the theory or start a new one from scratch. with the religious, the automatic reflex is "oh, it's a metaphor", "i know it says 'days' but it really means something else" etc etc etc. the possibility that the bible is just plain wrong never crosses the mind.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 19:26:33 GMT

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

reborn wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 08:31 Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 03 March 2009 16:31 Spoony wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 11:35 Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53 Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.

Spoony wrote fobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible. unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages Soooo.... anyone have a Bible on them, I'm at school and don't have one on me, someone should count up how many generations there were between Adam and Noah, Noah lived to be extremely old as well if I remember correctly, we should average Noah and Adam together and get a

ROUGH estimate of how long people were actually living. Because I seriously doubt that there were only 4 or 5 people born before Noah.

Even if you said they was working on the idea that the average person only lived 30 years, we can work out how many generations they had it out by doing $6000/30 = 200$.

So even if we said there was 200 generations, and each of them lived for 1000 years, that $200*1000 = 200,000$.

Although 200,000 years is allot more then 6000 years, it's still nowhere near 4.5 billion years.

Even if you said they lived 10,000 years, and only reproduced at the end of there life, then that's still only $200*10,000 = 2$ million years.

Whether the bible points towards an age of 6000 years or 2 million years, it's way off 4.5 billion years. My question remains, do you shrug it off and accept that science is right, and try not to think about this, or do you simply tell yourself that science always gets it wrong, hey, it wasn't that long ago they thought the Earth was flat.

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.

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

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 20:12:18 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26reborn wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 08:31Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 03 March 2009 16:31Spoony wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 11:35Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.

Spoony wrotefobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible.

unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages Soooo.... anyone have a Bible on them, I'm at school and don't have one on me, someone should count up how many generations there were between Adam and Noah, Noah lived to be extremely old as well if I remember correctly, we should average Noah and Adam together and get a ROUGH estimate of how long people were actually living. Because I seriously doubt that there were only 4 or 5 people born before Noah.

Even if you said they was working on the idea that the average person only lived 30 years, we can work out how many generations they had it out by doing $6000/30 = 200$.

So even if we said there was 200 generations, and each of them lived for 1000 years, that $200*1000 = 200,000$.

Although 200,000 years is allot more then 6000 years, it's still nowhere near 4.5 billion years. Even if you said they lived 10,000 years, and only reproduced at the end of there life, then that's still only $200 \times 10,000 = 2$ million years.

Whether the bible points towards an age of 6000 years or 2 million years, it's way off 4.5 billion years. My question remains, do you shrug it off and accept that science is right, and try not to think about this, or do you simply tell yourself that science always gets it wrong, hey, it wasn't that long ago they thought the Earth was flat.

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.

Other apes are the same as they were 1000s of years ago because they don't all evolve in one great change.

Only a handful will have mutations, and some of those mutants will survive and some will not. That doesn't mean the whole ape population is now mutant. Just 1 in 10,000.

The normal apes will continue to live and reproduce exactly as they do now.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26

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

Science has already proven they early has already "screwed itself over" many times already. Anything that has happened to the earth has been "fixed" through climate change and the effects that the change caused in the first place.

A good example is the many ice ages that have happened. The earth is only warmed by inferred radiation from the sun. So there has to be a surface that will absorb the radiation. We all know that black is better than white at absorbing this heat. The ice age causes a lot of snow to fall, and thus, the earth slowly cools again because it is no longer absorbing as much heat. Which restores the ice caps, which desalinize the sea and the north Atlantic current will start up again bringing heat to Europe from the equator.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 21:25:32 GMT

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

Did you know, when mt st Helen's went off, it put more greenhouse causing gases into the atmosphere then the human race has in its entire existence. Did you know that 3 equally powerful

volcanoes go off each year. Now multiply that by 4.5 billion years and explain to me how we still have an ozone layer...

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). 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. But what I can tell you, is that at some point in time, on of sciences most basic laws is WRONG. So, basically we are existing on loaned matter, and I'd hate to be around when it comes time to return said matter So 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 rater there be some though fist...

Was that completely off topic? Possibly... Just Remember the scientific standards...

4.5 Billion - Estimate

Evolution - Theory

Matter cannot be Created or Destroyed - Law

And please be open minded

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 21:47:59 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 21:25Did you know, when mt st Helen's went off, it put more greenhouse causing gases into the atmosphere then the human race has in its entire existence. Did you know that 3 equally powerful volcanoes go off each year. Now multiply that by 4.5 billion years and explain to me how we still have an ozone layer...

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). 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. But what I can tell you, is that at some point in time, on of sciences most basic laws is WRONG. So, basically we are existing on loaned matter, and I'd hate to be around when it comes time to return said matter So 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 rater there be some though fist...

Was that completely off topic? Possibly... Just Remember the scientific standards...

4.5 Billion - Estimate

Evolution - Theory

Matter cannot be Created or Destroyed - Law

And please be open minded

The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can convert energy into matter and the other way round.

The ozone layer is not effected by volcanoes erupting, I don't know where you got this from. The ozone layer also plays no part in global warming or the prevention of.

4.5 billion years is an estimate because it's such a high number, It's like saying 3.141 is an estimate of PI. We could easily say that the earth is definitely older than 1 million years at least.

Our laws of physics are not wrong, I can assure you that you have not found the "big flaw" in our science. We don't claim to know "everything" and unlike many religions, we don't make up crazy stories about how we came to be. We base our knowledge on stuff that we can see, observe and cut open. Ask any good scientist how the big bang was triggered and he will say he doesn't know. He could offer you a theory, sure, but he will not state that theory as fact.

Most scientists agree that the laws of physics that we have defined are -only- in our universe. Anything outside our universe may have different laws. Maybe a law that "matter cannot be created" is not the case outside our universe. Maybe a big ball of energy was created randomly outside of us and expanded into matter?

That's even besides the point! How could you believe that someone created the big bang in the first place if "the bible" says it didn't happen?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Mighty BOB!](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 22:03:20 GMT

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

The giant flying branes created the universe!

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 23:03:13 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:47

The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can

convert energy into matter and the other way round.
Ah silly me, I forgot energy could be created from nothing

I'm neither a scientist or a priest, I'm just trying to point out concepts here...

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 23:06:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 17:03RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:47
The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can
convert energy into matter and the other way round.
Ah silly me, I forgot energy could be created from nothing

I'm neither a scientist or a priest, I'm just trying to point out concepts here...
neither can god be created from nothing.
The difference is, the big bang theory at least has *some* evidence. even if its nearly nothing, its
mor than nothing

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 23:10:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Frontier Psychiatrist wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 16:06Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009
17:03RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:47
The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can
convert energy into matter and the other way round.
Ah silly me, I forgot energy could be created from nothing

I'm neither a scientist or a priest, I'm just trying to point out concepts here...
neither can god be created from nothing.
The difference is, the big bang theory at least has *some* evidence. even if its nearly nothing, its
mor than nothing
If 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 beings neither can LOGICALLY be, they are both EQUALLY possible.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [mrÃÄÅÄ·z](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 23:12:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Fuck the Bible,

our Planet sucks.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 23:31:26 GMT

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

madrackz wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 16:12 Fuck the Bible,

our Planet sucks.
POINT OF VIEW lol...

My life sucks, but, I know there are people that probably have it worse, and people that think they have it worse, knowing this is comforting, but doesn't help lol.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 00:26:11 GMT

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

Energy can't be created in a way we (as humans) can conceive (at this point in time?)

Also, to the person who said "god doesn't exist in time." To us, God would be a 4th dimensional being. Being able to move through the passage of time just as we can move forward/backward, left/right, up/down in space. You can't just "not exist in time." Because then that's just another way to say you don't exist, period.

As for how Earth should be in bad shape given its age: It should be in the condition it is in now. Most of Earth's surface is renewable and can regenerate itself. Meaning much of Earth's features come back after time. Now, take into consideration all the features on Earth's surface that do show age. Take into consideration erosion and its effects on other things on the surface. Mountains, valleys, oceans, ect.

Not to mention all of the moving plates over Earth's surface and how all of Earth used to be one large continent (instead of the 7 we have currently).

My point is, Earth shows its age in many, many different ways. And it is much older than 4.5 million years.

Edit:

Also, how can it possibly make more sense for humans to just appear out of nothing and breed from two people rather than evolve from apes? Obviously, the reason behind why not all monkeys evolved into Humans is due to habitat and location. Evolution occurs as a reaction to outside environments over long extended periods of time. Not only that, but there are many different

species of monkeys.. so not all of them could have evolved into one species of human...

And isn't disbelieving we evolved from apes because of how inadequate apes are from humans both against religious tolerance and completely arrogant at the same time?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 00:54:42 GMT

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

Idiots... when people say that the earth is 4.5 billion years old... they don't mean that humans/life have been established for that long. Our entire planet was molten, and then it took a couple (am I right?) to start to cool down enough to where liquid water could form, and so on and so forth. Clearly, humans weren't on the earth 4.5 billion years ago.

Overall, I've never discounted the fact that a supreme being could very well have "created" the universe. The thing is, it's been said before... it's only been in the past 1000 years that we've really started to understand the world that surrounds us. Science, compared to the world's and mankind's existence, is still in its infancy. Hell, at one point it was considered that everything had a soul because everything wanted to go toward the center of the earth. Gravity... wasn't even thought of.

How does history get remembered when it wasn't recorded? It was passed down from generation to generation through stories. Add that to the simplistic understanding of physical science and you end up with stories that are told (and eventually recorded) in a manner that was understood by the people.

Oh, and don't forget that Genesis was written in song form. Now, I don't have any resources for this besides what I heard during a sermon at my parents' church. The church doesn't interpret the Bible the way they see fit, so that it fits their lives. They actually take a step back and realize that the Bible was written by more than one person, in more than one language, and written in contexts that we may not fully understand or would completely miss if we don't have an understanding of the cultures represented.

So yes, science and the Bible can go hand-in-hand quite easily. It just means you have to understand Biblical cultures before you assume that the Medieval translators actually knew what they were translating (they didn't).

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 00:55:41 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 17:26 Energy can't be created in a way we (as humans) can conceive (at this point in time?)

Also, to the person who said "god doesn't exist in time." To us, God would be a 4th dimensional

being. Being able to move through the passage of time just as we can move forward/backward, left/right, up/down in space. You can't just "not exist in time." Because then that's just another way to say you don't exist, period.

As for how Earth should be in bad shape given its age: It should be in the condition it is in now. Most of Earth's surface is renewable and can regenerate itself. Meaning much of Earth's features come back after time. Now, take into consideration all the features on Earth's surface that do show age. Take into consideration erosion and its effects on other things on the surface. Mountains, valleys, oceans, ect.

Not to mention all of the moving plates over Earth's surface and how all of Earth used to be one large continent (instead of the 7 we have currently).

My point is, Earth shows its age in many, many different ways. And it is much older than 4.5 million years.

Edit:

Also, how can it possibly make more sense for humans to just appear out of nothing and breed from two people rather than evolve from apes? Obviously, the reason behind why not all monkeys evolved into Humans is due to habitat and location. Evolution occurs as a reaction to outside environments over long extended periods of time. Not only that, but there are many different species of monkeys.. so not all of them could have evolved into one species of human...

And isn't disbelieving we evolved from apes because of how inadequate apes are from humans both against religious tolerance and completely arrogant at the same time? 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....

Also I was talking about the ozone layer being in as good of shape as it is... but I was misinformed, at some point in my life one of my teachers taught our class that green house causing gases deplete the ozone layer, but now after doing a simple google search I see that fact isn't true. BUT my other half of the volcano one IS, and if you don't believe me feel free to google it, I just did, and it was the first link I clicked on...

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 04:59:02 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 07:12 Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26 reborn wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 08:31 Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 03 March 2009 16:31 Spooky wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 11:35 Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53 Genisis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.
Spooky wrote fobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible.

unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages Soooo.... anyone have a Bible on them, I'm at school and don't have one on me, someone should count up how many generations there were between Adam and Noah, Noah lived to be extremely old as well if I remember correctly, we should average Noah and Adam together and get a ROUGH estimate of how long people were actually living. Because I seriously doubt that there were only 4 or 5 people born before Noah.

Even if you said they was working on the idea that the average person only lived 30 years, we can work out how many generations they had it out by doing $6000/30 = 200$.

So even if we said there was 200 generations, and each of them lived for 1000 years, that $200*1000 = 200,000$.

Although 200,000 years is allot more then 6000 years, it's still nowhere near 4.5 billion years.

Even if you said they lived 10,000 years, and only reproduced at the end of there life, then that's still only $200*10,000 = 2$ million years.

Whether the bible points towards an age of 6000 years or 2 million years, it's way off 4.5 billion years. My question remains, do you shrug it off and accept that science is right, and try not to think about this, or do you simply tell yourself that science always gets it wrong, hey, it wasn't that long ago they thought the Earth was flat.

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.

Other apes are the same as they were 1000s of years ago because they don't all evolve in one great change.

Only a handful will have mutations, and some of those mutants will survive and some will not. That doesn't mean the whole ape population is now mutant. Just 1 in 10,000.

The normal apes will continue to live and reproduce exactly as they do now.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26

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

Science has already proven they early has already "screwed itself over" many times already. Anything that has happened to the earth has been "fixed" through climate change and the effects that the change caused in the first place.

A good example is the many ice ages that have happened. The earth is only warmed by inferred radiation from the sun. So there has to be a surface that will absorb the radiation. We all know that black is better than white at absorbing this heat. The ice age causes a lot of snow to fall, and thus, the earth slowly cools again because it is no longer absorbing as much heat. Which restores the ice caps, which desalinize the sea and the north Atlantic current will start up again bringing heat to Europe from the equator.

I just want to bring this argument forward again.

Perhaps we were a mistake or something bad that happened to the Earth, and thus the whole global warming thing, along with all the other things, aren't our own fault at all, just something that happens. Maybe the Earth simply wipes the world clear of life every few millenia and starts again. This brings forth a possibility that the Earth could be untold billions of years old, so old that Science nor God's existence could begin to explain it. It could be a possibility that we will be wiped off the face of this planet, with all our technology, all our science, all our religion, everything, by the same planet that gave birth to and/or nurtured our race, depending on your belief. If this is true, then how will we ever be able to know how old the Earth is if it continues to start anew?

If God travels 'out of time', shall we say, and exists in an alternate universe or dimension, that would give a valid reason as to how he can be everywhere at once. However it would also give the question of how he could possibly create anything in our universe if he existed in an alternate? I don't think it would be possible for any being, by themselves, to jump through dimensions and universes like that. Scientifically, it's not possible. But in regards to magic and unknown, it is. The arguments put forth are simply the unknown.

I close by saying everything we're arguing on is truly unknown, and whether we have theory or evidence or not is irrelevant when we still don't know the answer. Let's put this in context of, lets say, a criminal case. You find evidence that a suspect was at the scene of a robbery. Does that mean he's instantly guilty, that it's true? No, and even when all things point to the suspect, sometimes it's still wrong. How do they know, then? The answer is simple: they don't. Just like science's estimate, they don't really know. Just like the Bible's word, we don't know if it's true. Plain and simply, it's unknown, and I don't believe either science OR religion will be able to answer that one.

So I'm gonna go visit my friends and enjoy my life while I can instead of staying up all night wondering how old the planet is.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 05:23:39 GMT

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

Jerad Gray wrote But 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.

Jerad Gray wrote So, 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.

Jerad Gray wrote So 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.)

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

Jerad Gray wrote Evolution - Theory

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

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?

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'?

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.

Jerad Gray probably should have wrote I 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?

Jerad Gray wrote If 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!

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

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 05:30:02 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23

Stuff from way previous post that I don't care to talk about again...

Please don't bring extremely old posts of mine back up, I moved past that along time ago lol

Stay with the current, everyone else has already picked it over.

Jerad wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:25 Did you know, when mt st Helen's went off, it put more greenhouse causing gases into the atmosphere than the human race has in its entire existence. Did you know that 3 equally powerful volcanoes go off each year. Now multiply that by 4.5 billion years and explain to me how we still have an ozone layer...

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). 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. But what I can tell you, is that at some point in time, one of sciences most basic laws is WRONG. So, basically we are existing on loaned matter, and I'd hate to be around when it comes time to return said matter. So 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 rater there be some though fist...

Was that completely off topic? Possibly... Just Remember the scientific standards...

4.5 Billion - Estimate

Evolution - Theory

Matter cannot be Created or Destroyed - Law

And please be open minded

[quote title=Jerad wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 16:03]RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:47

The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can convert energy into matter and the other way round.

Ah silly me, I forgot energy could be created from nothing

I'm neither a scientist or a priest, I'm just trying to point out concepts here...[/quote]

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 05:32:12 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:30 Stuff from way previous post that I don't care to talk about again...

Another one bites the dust.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 05:33:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:32Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:30Stuff from way previous post that I don't care to talk about again...

Another one bites the dust.

Or another one can't stay up to date. My Infinite time can't be spent rereading stuff I typed hours ago over and over again.

Also, humans are not perfect, so I choose not to believe everything science says, especially when it comes down to things that happened "4.5 BILLION years ago."

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:30Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23 Stuff from way previous post that I don't care to talk about again...

Please don't bring extremely old posts of mine back up, I moved past that along time ago lol Stay with the current, everyone else has already picked it over.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:25Did you know, when mt st Helen's went off, it put more greenhouse causing gases into the atmosphere then the human race has in its entire existence. Did you know that 3 equally powerful volcanoes go off each year. Now multiply that by 4.5 billion years and explain to me how we still have an ozone layer...

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). 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. But what I can tell you, is that at some point in time, one of sciences most basic laws is WRONG. So, basically we are existing on loaned matter, and I'd hate to be around when it comes time to return said matter So 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 rater there be some though fist...

Was that completely off topic? Possibly... Just Remember the scientific standards...

4.5 Billion - Estimate

Evolution - Theory

Matter cannot be Created or Destroyed - Law

And please be open minded

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 16:03RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:47 The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can convert energy into matter and the other way round.

Ah silly me, I forgot energy could be created from nothing

I'm neither a scientist or a priest, I'm just trying to point out concepts here...[/quote]

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 they have the desire to.

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

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 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.

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, on of sciences 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 rater 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 wrote Evolution - 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 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.
Spoony 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...

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 wrote I 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 wroteI 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.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 05:56:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33Or another one can't stay up to date. My Infinite time can't be spent rereading stuff I typed hours ago over and over again.
If you're going to admit you're extremely unqualified to take part in a debate of this kind, go ahead. I don't really understand the lack of defensiveness, though.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33Please don't bring extremely old posts of mine back up, I moved past that along time ago lol
A day is 'extremely old'? Are we back in biblical 'metaphor' territory again? As for moving past it, you haven't admitted you were talking complete bullshit, as my post clearly demonstrates.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33Stay with the current, everyone else has already picked it over.
What strange ideas you have.

What's REALLY puzzling is your repetition of these three quotes of yours:

1.
Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33Also, humans are not perfect, so I choose not to believe everything science says, especially when it comes down to things that happened "4.5 BILLION years ago."

2.
Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:25Did you know, when mt st Helen's went off, it put more greenhouse causing gases into the atmosphere than the human race has in its entire existence. Did you know that 3 equally powerful volcanoes go off each year. Now multiply that by 4.5 billion years and explain to me how we still have an ozone layer...

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).

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. But what I can tell you, is that at some point in time, one of sciences most basic laws is WRONG. So, basically we are existing on loaned matter, and I'd hate to be around when it comes time to return said matter. So 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...

Was that completely off topic? Possibly... Just Remember the scientific standards...

4.5 Billion - Estimate

Evolution - Theory

Matter cannot be Created or Destroyed - Law

And please be open minded
and 3.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 16:03RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:47

The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can convert energy into matter and the other way round.

Ah silly me, I forgot energy could be created from nothing

I'm neither a scientist or a priest, I'm just trying to point out concepts here...

You repeat them as if you're trying to get everyone to stop ignoring them. Firstly I already picked them apart and showed you why almost everything you said was complete bullshit, and you didn't respond to that. Secondly, if you can make up ridiculous rules of debate on the fly which conveniently allow you to ignore the fact you were proven absolutely dead wrong about something, am I allowed to do the same and simply say: you're hereby excluded from the debate because you lost it, and nothing you say can appeal from that decision?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 05:59:19 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:56Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33Or another one can't stay up to date. My Infinite time can't be spent rereading stuff I typed hours ago over and over again.

If you're going to admit you're extremely unqualified to take part in a debate of this kind, go ahead. I don't really understand the lack of defensiveness, though.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33Please don't bring extremely old posts of mine back up, I moved past that along time ago lol

A day is 'extremely old'? Are we back in biblical 'metaphor' territory again? As for moving past it, you haven't admitted you were talking complete bullshit, as my post clearly demonstrates.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33 Stay with the current, everyone else has already picked it over.

What strange ideas you have.

What's REALLY puzzling is your repetition of these three quotes of yours:

1.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:33 Also, humans are not perfect, so I choose not to believe everything science says, especially when it comes down to things that happened "4.5 BILLION years ago."

2.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:25 Did you know, when mt st Helen's went off, it put more greenhouse causing gases into the atmosphere then the human race has in its entire existence. Did you know that 3 equally powerful volcanoes go off each year. Now multiply that by 4.5 billion years and explain to me how we still have an ozone layer...

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). 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. But what I can tell you, is that at some point in time, on of sciences most basic laws is WRONG. So, basically we are existing on loaned matter, and I'd hate to be around when it comes time to return said matter So 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 rater there be some though fist...

Was that completely off topic? Possibly... Just Remember the scientific standards...

4.5 Billion - Estimate

Evolution - Theory

Matter cannot be Created or Destroyed - Law

And please be open minded

and 3.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 16:03 RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 14:47

The big bang actually started as a sort of "energy ball", pure energy. We already know you can convert energy into matter and the other way round.

Ah silly me, I forgot energy could be created from nothing

I'm neither a scientist or a priest, I'm just trying to point out concepts here...

You repeat them as if you're trying to get everyone to stop ignoring them. Firstly I already picked them apart and showed you why almost everything you said was complete bullshit, and you didn't respond to that. Secondly, if you can make up ridiculous rules of debate on the fly which conveniently allow you to ignore the fact you were proven absolutely dead wrong about something, am I allowed to do the same and simply say: you're hereby excluded from the debate because you lost it, and nothing you say can appeal from that decision?

Settle down spoony, no reason to start flipping out, its just renegade forums, what you say here will NEVER make a difference no matter what side your on.

But 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.

Also I consider it extremely old when its 4 of my posts ago, and we have already moved past it.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoon](#) 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 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.

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 23:52Yes 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 23:52Spoony wroteYou'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 23:52Spoony wroteJerad 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.

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 23:52Spoony wroteJerad 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.
Why do you think matter was "created" out of nothing?

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52
Spoony 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, that's 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 23:52
Your 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 23:52
Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23
Jerad Gray probably should have written I 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 23:52
Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23
Jerad Gray wrote If I was god, I'd be a dick and purposely create it to 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 23:52
Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23
Jerad Gray wrote And 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 wrote Settle 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"?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 07:11:40 GMT

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

This topic is getting a little out of hand with the way you two are getting a bit off-track in some bits. I suggest we just get back on topic. Not saying that you were ignoring the topic, I know you were debating in most parts, but part of your replies were getting out of context.

I'm finding this topic very interesting and I don't really wanna waste time reading things like that. If it could be cut down, thanks.

This sorta thing I'm not really enthusiastic about reading:

Toggle SpoilerSpoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 17:48

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 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"?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 07:26:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Original QuoteSpoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:48Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 23:52I 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.
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 23:52Spoony wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 22:23
Jerad Gray wroteI 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.
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 23:52Spoony wroteJerad Gray wroteBut 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.
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 23:52Spoony wroteJerad Gray wroteNow, 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 Spoony 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 Spoony 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 Spoony 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 23:52Spoony 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...
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 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.
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 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?
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"?

Reply that doesn't matter

Thats just a mess too look at.

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

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

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

I can't tell you what to believe.

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

Yeah must have missed that one, sorry.

Yep

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...

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

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

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

Thats what you have come to believe now isn't it.

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

I was talking about all the ad hominem.

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.

Look above...

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.

Didn't know I was, you must know more about the bible than I do, good for you!

Obviously it ended up being no one, give it some thought and you'll realize why (or you might have to reread everything without all these breaks in it). Also, don't bother typing a response to any of this, I don't want you to waste your time, I'm not going to be open minded to your points being your not about mine.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 07:27:43 GMT

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

Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 00:11 This topic is getting a little out of hand with the way you two are getting a bit off-track in some bits. I suggest we just get back on topic. Not saying that you were ignoring the topic, I know you were debating in most parts, but part of your replies were getting out of context.

I'm finding this topic very interesting and I don't really wanna waste time reading things like that. If it could be cut down, thanks.

This sorta thing I'm not really enthusiastic about reading:

Toggle SpoilerSpoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 17:48

Jerad Gray wrote Settle 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 wrote its just renegade forums

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

Jerad Gray wrote But 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"?

Agreed

Max Earth Age, GO!

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 07:44:20 GMT

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

Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 04:59RoShamBo wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 07:12Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26reborn wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 08:31Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 03 March 2009 16:31Spoony wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 11:35Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.

Spoony wrotefobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible. unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages Soooo.... anyone have a Bible on them, I'm at school and don't have one on me, someone should count up how many generations there were between Adam and Noah, Noah lived to be extremely old as well if I remember correctly, we should average Noah and Adam together and get a ROUGH estimate of how long people were actually living. Because I seriously doubt that there were only 4 or 5 people born before Noah.

Even if you said they was working on the idea that the average person only lived 30 years, we can work out how many generations they had it out by doing $6000/30 = 200$.

So even if we said there was 200 generations, and each of them lived for 1000 years, that $200*1000 = 200,000$.

Although 200,000 years is allot more then 6000 years, it's still nowhere near 4.5 billion years.

Even if you said they lived 10,000 years, and only reproduced at the end of there life, then that's still only $200*10,000 = 2$ million years.

Whether the bible points towards an age of 6000 years or 2 million years, it's way off 4.5 billion years. My question remains, do you shrug it off and accept that science is right, and try not to think about this, or do you simply tell yourself that science always gets it wrong, hey, it wasn't that long ago they thought the Earth was flat.

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.

Other apes are the same as they were 1000s of years ago because they don't all evolve in one great change.

Only a handful will have mutations, and some of those mutants will survive and some will not. That doesn't mean the whole ape population is now mutant. Just 1 in 10,000.

The normal apes will continue to live and reproduce exactly as they do now.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26

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

Science has already proven they early has already "screwed itself over" many times already. Anything that has happened to the earth has been "fixed" through climate change and the effects that the change caused in the first place.

A good example is the many ice ages that have happened. The earth is only warmed by inferred radiation from the sun. So there has to be a surface that will absorb the radiation. We all know that black is better than white at absorbing this heat. The ice age causes a lot of snow to fall, and thus, the earth slowly cools again because it is no longer absorbing as much heat. Which restores the ice caps, which desalinize the sea and the north Atlantic current will start up again bringing heat to Europe from the equator.

I just want to bring this argument forward again.

Perhaps we were a mistake or something bad that happened to the Earth, and thus the whole global warming thing, along with all the other things, aren't our own fault at all, just something that happens. Maybe the Earth simply wipes the world clear of life every few millenia and starts again. This brings forth a possibility that the Earth could be untold billions of years old, so old that Science nor God's existence could begin to explain it. It could be a possibility that we will be wiped off the face of this planet, with all our technology, all our science, all our religion, everything, by the same planet that gave birth to and/or nurtured our race, depending on your belief. If this is true, then how will we ever be able to know how old the Earth is if it continues to start anew?

The earth doesn't "destroy itself" and start from scratch. You can see hard evidence of climate change in ice cores.

Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 04:59

If God travels 'out of time', shall we say, and exists in an alternate universe or dimension, that would give a valid reason as to how he can be everywhere at once. However it would also give the question of how he could possibly create anything in our universe if he existed in an alternate?

I don't think it would be possible for any being, by themselves, to jump through dimensions and universes like that. Scientifically, it's not possible. But in regards to magic and unknown, it is. The arguments put forth are simply the unknown.

This exact theory also fits quite nicely for the big bang, too.

Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 04:59

So I'm gonna go visit my friends and enjoy my life while I can instead of staying up all night wondering how old the planet is.

Nice, I don't need to stay up all night because science has already given me an answer backed up by facts.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 07:58:28 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 00:44Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 04:59RoShamBo wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 07:12Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26reborn wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 08:31Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 03 March 2009 16:31Spoony wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 11:35Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 01 March 2009 14:53Genesis 5:3-5 When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image; and he named him Seth. After Seth was born, Adam lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Adam lived 930 years, and then he died. Everyone before Noah lived very long lives before they died. Take that into consideration before you say that we believe that people have only been here 6,000 years.

Spoony wrotefobby, it's basically done by counting the number of generations in the bible. unfortunately the people who do so don't seem to mind that people attend impossibly old ages Soooo.... anyone have a Bible on them, I'm at school and don't have one on me, someone should count up how many generations there were between Adam and Noah, Noah lived to be extremely old as well if I remember correctly, we should average Noah and Adam together and get a ROUGH estimate of how long people were actually living. Because I seriously doubt that there were only 4 or 5 people born before Noah.

Even if you said they was working on the idea that the average person only lived 30 years, we can work out how many generations they had it out by doing $6000/30 = 200$.

So even if we said there was 200 generations, and each of them lived for 1000 years, that $200*1000 = 200,000$.

Although 200,000 years is allot more then 6000 years, it's still nowhere near 4.5 billion years.

Even if you said they lived 10,000 years, and only reproduced at the end of there life, then that's still only $200*10,000 = 2$ million years.

Whether the bible points towards an age of 6000 years or 2 million years, it's way off 4.5 billion years. My question remains, do you shrug it off and accept that science is right, and try not to

think about this, or do you simply tell yourself that science always gets it wrong, hey, it wasn't that long ago they thought the Earth was flat.

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.

Other apes are the same as they were 1000s of years ago because they don't all evolve in one great change.

Only a handful will have mutations, and some of those mutants will survive and some will not. That doesn't mean the whole ape population is now mutant. Just 1 in 10,000.

The normal apes will continue to live and reproduce exactly as they do now.

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:26

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

Science has already proven they early has already "screwed itself over" many times already. Anything that has happened to the earth has been "fixed" through climate change and the effects that the change caused in the first place.

A good example is the many ice ages that have happened. The earth is only warmed by inferred radiation from the sun. So there has to be a surface that will absorb the radiation. We all know that black is better than white at absorbing this heat. The ice age causes a lot of snow to fall, and thus, the earth slowly cools again because it is no longer absorbing as much heat. Which restores the ice caps, which desalinize the sea and the north Atlantic current will start up again bringing heat to Europe from the equator.

I just want to bring this argument forward again.

Perhaps we were a mistake or something bad that happened to the Earth, and thus the whole global warming thing, along with all the other things, aren't our own fault at all, just something that happens. Maybe the Earth simply wipes the world clear of life every few millenia and starts again. This brings forth a possibility that the Earth could be untold billions of years old, so old that Science nor God's existence could begin to explain it. It could be a possibility that we will be wiped off the face of this planet, with all our technology, all our science, all our religion, everything, by the same planet that gave birth to and/or nurtured our race, depending on your belief. If this is true, then how will we ever be able to know how old the Earth is if it continues to start anew?

The earth doesn't "destroy itself" and start from scratch. You can see hard evidence of climate change in ice cores.

Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 04:59

If God travels 'out of time', shall we say, and exists in an alternate universe or dimension, that would give a valid reason as to how he can be everywhere at once. However it would also give the question of how he could possibly create anything in our universe if he existed in an alternate? I don't think it would be possible for any being, by themselves, to jump through dimensions and universes like that. Scientifically, it's not possible. But in regards to magic and unknown, it is. The arguments put forth are simply the unknown.

This exact theory also fits quite nicely for the big bang, too.

Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 04:59

So I'm gonna go visit my friends and enjoy my life while I can instead of staying up all night wondering how old the planet is.

Nice, I don't need to stay up all night because science has already given me an answer backed up by facts.

God created everything yesterday and just made everything look like its been here for a while, he also made us thing that we had lives prior to that moment

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 08:55:46 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 18:58

God created everything yesterday and just made everything look like its been here for a while, he also made us thing that we had lives prior to that moment
Exactly!

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 then 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.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [mr£ÄŞÄ-z](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 10:41:50 GMT

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

Haha go play Renegade everyone

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 13:10:00 GMT

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

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

haha

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 14:20:14 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 01:27Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 00:11This topic is getting a little out of hand with the way you two are getting a bit off-track in some bits. I suggest we just get back on topic. Not saying that you were ignoring the topic, I know you were

debating in most parts, but part of your replies were getting out of context.

I'm finding this topic very interesting and I don't really wanna waste time reading things like that. If it could be cut down, thanks.

This sorta thing I'm not really enthusiastic about reading:

Toggle SpoilerSpoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 17:48

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 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"?

Agreed

Of course you agree, since he made the bizarre assertion that we're both responsible for those specific points being 'off-topic', when a quick read of each one will see the blame lies solely on you, since you have you saying something either factually wrong, wildly irrelevant, or plain incoherent, and me just asking you what the hell you're talking about. Of course you aren't enthusiastic to hear my replies; can't have people asking you "what are you talking about?" when you say something really dense. You might actually have to answer!

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 14:43:43 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 07:20Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009

01:27Karandras wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 00:11This topic is getting a little out of hand with the way you two are getting a bit off-track in some bits. I suggest we just get back on topic. Not saying that you were ignoring the topic, I know you were debating in most parts, but part of your replies were getting out of context.

I'm finding this topic very interesting and I don't really wanna waste time reading things like that. If it could be cut down, thanks.

This sorta thing I'm not really enthusiastic about reading:
Toggle SpoilerSpoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 17:48
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 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"?

Agreed

Of course you agree, since he made the bizarre assertion that we're both responsible for those specific points being 'off-topic', when a quick read of each one will see the blame lies solely on you, since you have you saying something either factually wrong, wildly irrelevant, or plain incoherent, and me just asking you what the hell you're talking about. Of course you aren't enthusiastic to hear my replies; can't have people asking you "what are you talking about?" when you say something really dense. You might actually have to answer!

Okay 3 things, 1. This is Renforums, no one has to answer anything if they don't want to. 2. The topic was "How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible." so we were off topic the whole time as neither of us were discussing an actual age of the planet. 3. This reply is just off topic as the one your replying too, as your lecturing me, unless that somehow is going to allow you to know the age of this planet, I suggest you avoid it.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 15:09:38 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 15:43Okay 3 things, 1. This is Renforums, no one has to answer anything if they don't want to.

I was speaking figuratively if it wasn't obvious; you certainly can refuse to respond to almost anything I've said (as you have done so often already) without any punishment except perhaps looking stupid and ignorant.

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 15:432. The topic was "How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible." so we were off topic the whole time as neither of us were discussing an actual age of the planet.

Indeed, all you were doing was telling me certain posts of yours are off-topic, and making absurd statements like "we have moved on" (who's "we"?). All I did was ask you what the bloody hell you're talking about; if you can't handle that, try to make more sense in the first place.

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 15:43. This reply is just off topic as the one your replying too, as your lecturing me, unless that somehow is going to allow you to know the age of this planet, I suggest you avoid it.

I just pointed out that the only person Karandras ought to whinge at for "going off-topic" is you rather than both of us, and also pointed out the absurdity of you agreeing with him. But then, it's hardly the most bizarre thing you've said so far.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 15:28:52 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 08:09 Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 15:43 Okay 3 things, 1. This is Renforums, no one has to answer anything if they don't want to.

I was speaking figuratively if it wasn't obvious; you certainly can refuse to respond to almost anything I've said (as you have done so often already) without any punishment except perhaps looking stupid and ignorant.

Don't know, right now its starting to seem pretty stupid to keep waisting my time replying back to you.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 08:09

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 15:43. The topic was "How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible." so we were off topic the whole time as neither of us were discussing an actual age of the planet.

Indeed, all you were doing was telling me certain posts of yours are off-topic, and making absurd statements like "we have moved on" (who's "we"?). All I did was ask you what the bloody hell you're talking about; if you can't handle that, try to make more sense in the first place.

Basic understanding of the English language is nice, but your going into over kill, don't be too much of a grammar queen or else you may fail to realize that when I'm saying we in this case, it would be me and the person that seems to feel that he must keep replying to my posts, even though he has admitted he doesn't understand what I was going at in the first place, at which point I'd just drop the whole thing, because I definitely understood what I was talking about...

Spoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 08:09

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 15:43. This reply is just off topic as the one your replying too, as your lecturing me, unless that somehow is going to allow you to know the age of this planet, I suggest you avoid it.

I just pointed out that the only person Karandras ought to whinge at for "going off-topic" is you rather than both of us, and also pointed out the absurdity of you agreeing with him. But then, it's hardly the most bizarre thing you've said so far.

Do believe that I posted first, then you replied to me, so if I was off topic you definitely were.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 15:43:07 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:28 Don't know, right now its starting to seem pretty stupid to keep waisting my time replying back to you.

It seems stupid to me too, given that you kept refusing to respond to those points I made which were, by anybody's book, on-topic. Y'know, creationism and such.

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:28 Basic understanding of the English language is nice, but your going into over kill, don't be too much of a grammar queen

My original point was about this 'sentence':

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).

I simply pointed out that this does not make sense. It's not a complete sentence, there are obviously words missing. I just asked you what you're actually trying to say here, and all you've done is insult me for asking so much. I fail to see why I'm a 'grammar queen' for pointing out that what you're saying simply does not make sense unless the reader has to add in his own words to fill in the gaps.

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:28 or else you may fail to realize that when I'm saying we in this case, it would be me and the person that seems to feel that he must keep replying to my posts, even though he has admitted he doesn't understand what I was going at in the first place, at which point I'd just drop the whole thing, because I definitely understood what I was talking about...

I think you're even more confused than usual here.

You refused to respond to anything I said (about creationism) on the grounds that "it's extremely old" and "we've moved on". So who is "we"? It can't be me because you seemed to think I was not allowed to join in the debate, thereby contradicting everything you've just said. As for "seems to feel he must keep replying to my posts", that doesn't make sense either since, again, you are too closed-minded to actually read and reply to anything I've said (couple this with the bizarre assertion that I'm the one being closed-minded, this entire thread proving the exact opposite). And the fact you definitely understood what you were talking about is not really a bragging right; it's easy for you to add your own words to fill in the gaps in incomplete sentences so they aren't so garbled, but of course it would be easier for the author than the reader, wouldn't it?

It's a little pitiful that you're so eager to spout this condescending nonsense just to make yourself feel better about the fact you couldn't refute a single thing I said about the actual topic.

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:28 Do believe that I posted first, then you replied to me, so if I was off topic you definitely were.

I didn't say I wasn't off topic, it wasn't me whingeing about that, it was you and karandras. I was merely pointing out the stupidity of claiming that we shared equal blame for it, coupled with your own refusal to respond to anything I say that undeniably is on-topic.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 15:52:29 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 08:43Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:28Basic understanding of the English language is nice, but your going into over kill, don't be too much of a grammar queen

My original point was about this 'sentence':

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). I simply pointed out that this does not make sense. It's not a complete sentence, there are obviously words missing. I just asked you what you're actually trying to say here, and all you've done is insult me for asking so much. I fail to see why I'm a 'grammar queen' for pointing out that what you're saying simply does not make sense unless the reader has to add in his own words to fill in the gaps.

Sighs No, its all there, what I am saying is that it would have been more logical for nothing (no planets, starts, life, galaxies, energy, ect.) to have existed at all, at any point in time, in fact, it would have made more sense for time itself not to have existed.

I also use "We" to refer to the human race at times

Finally, why should I respond to your points while I'm still trying to get you to understand the ones your quoting?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 15:53:47 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 08:43Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:28Basic understanding of the English language is nice, but your going into over kill, don't be too much of a grammar queen

My original point was about this 'sentence':

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). I simply pointed out that this does not make sense. It's not a complete sentence, there are obviously words missing. I just asked you what you're actually trying to say here, and all you've done is insult me for asking so much. I fail to see why I'm a 'grammar queen' for pointing out that what you're saying simply does not make sense unless the reader has to add in his own words to fill in the gaps.

Sighs No, its all there, what I am saying is that it would have been more logical for nothing (no planets, starts, life, galaxies, energy, ect.) to have existed at all, at any point in time, in fact, it would have made more sense for time itself not to have existed.

I also use "We" to refer to the human race at times

Finally, why should I respond to your points while I'm still trying to get you to understand the ones your quoting?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 06 Mar 2009 16:31:12 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:52*Sighs* No, its all there, what I am saying is that it would have been more logical for nothing (no planets, starts, life, galaxies, energy, ect.) to have existed at all, at any point in time, in fact, it would have made more sense for time itself not to have existed.

Thanks for finally explaining that. I don't know why I had to ask so many times for you to just answer the question instead of insulting me. I guess you can't help it, given your nature... just look at my signature, for one thing.

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:52I also use "We" to refer to the human race at times

You dodge the point yet again. I asked what "we've moved on" is supposed to mean, when you use it as your reason not to respond to anything I say, even though the obvious reason is simply that you know you can't but you are too arrogant and closed-minded to simply admit you were wrong about something.

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 06 March 2009 09:52Finally, why should I respond to your points while I'm still trying to get you to understand the ones your quoting?

Your arrogance is breathtaking. It's bad enough that you think it's all my fault that I ask you to clarify a point you tried to make when you can't even put it into a complete sentence; it's bad enough that you insult me personally simply for asking you what you're talking about when your post clearly doesn't make sense. It's nothing short of bizarre, however, to retroactively use your nonsensical assertions there to justify your EARLIER refusal to respond to my points to do with creationism. You really don't know how stupid and ignorant you're repeatedly proving yourself to be, I expect.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 07 Mar 2009 02:40:25 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 05 March 2009 19:55

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....

Who said that micro-organisms "magically appeared?" The thing is, if you break life down, it really isn't that hard to understand. A small organism could have simply created itself through any sort of microscopic synthetic means, then reproduced itself over and over, then from there, evolved.

Or perhaps life on Earth didn't actually start on Earth? When Earth was still just a molten rock floating randomly in space, it was pulverized with meteorites. Who's to say that some microscopic

biological lifeforms weren't originally from deep space and were simply transferred to Earth via one or a few of these meteors?

My point is, there are many scientific theories that make sense as to how life came to be on Earth. And each of those theories don't include any of the hazy inconsistent information that any of the theories presented through religion contain.

Edit: I replied to this post before I read any of the posts after it, fyi.

After reading some other posts I can reply to some of the points I remember off the top of my head:

Nothing: There can't be nothing. We both can and can't comprehend the concept of nothing. It's just nothing, no space no time, no light no lack there of, nothing. If something like that ever (didn't?) exist(ed), then nothing we have here today would have ever came to be. In order to create, something else of equal value must be lost. If there is absolutely nothing as mentioned above, nothing else can't simply just "spawn" there creating space, time, energy, and matter. And there isn't anything that can put that there either because something would have had to have existed in order to put those things there.. thus contradicting the entire point of there being "nothing."

Therefore it is impossible for there to be nothing. There has always been and always will be two things in existence: Space and time. Just as there will be sub categories that fit into space and time, such as matter and energy.

"I don't see eating bugs off my friends as civilized.":

That's because your mind has evolved past the point of simple instinct. We have grown to have the power to think freely and control instinct. Gained emotional control. Feeling control.

What you might think as "gross" and "disgusting" would simply be thought as strictly instinctive by other animals. I mean, if you, as a human, don't like the feeling of being "gross" or "disgusting," what makes you think other animals would feel any differently? The fact is, they wouldn't like it, as it is an unlikeable feeling. But pushing that aside, they don't have the luxury we do as to being able to decide what is gross and what is not.

"Humans are "all-knowing" because of their "science""

I've already explained this before, science is simply the STUDY OF THINGS THAT ALREADY EXIST IN OUR WORLD. All we, as humans, are doing is observing these things that exist and then recording them into statistics and data that we can read later.

The only thing's that Humans have created in terms of science is the means to read, measure, observe, and record data.

Did humans invent the flow of time? No! Only the means to read it. (Hours, minutes, Days, years, ect.)

We, as humans, only know what we have learned through observation and logical deduction. Truth be told, we know more about outer space than we do about our own planet. So.. how exactly are humans "all-knowing?"

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 07 Mar 2009 06:31:05 GMT

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

Religious people don't like to look at the facts when they think about their beliefs. It's all about brainwashing kids with religious garbage when they're young and ingrain it in them so that when they grow up they won't try so hard to truly think about their existence. They will always be dumb and unable to think until they stop putting their fingers in their ears and going lalala whenever science is mentioned.

although I suppose if there wasn't any stupid people we wouldn't know who the smart ones were.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Sat, 07 Mar 2009 09:25:08 GMT

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

My god, you just don't shut up, Spooky. I originally blamed you equally, and then you called that stupid, but the funny thing is that by saying that you're getting more and more off-topic which is exactly what I was on about.

So now you've just gone on about it proving me right even more.
Topicwise:

GET ON WITH IT!

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Sat, 07 Mar 2009 14:56:45 GMT

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

this topic should be stated by enormous bullshit.
And therefore should be closed, in anyway you want to debate about how old the earth is, you should read the bible and darwins theory before you start discussing this stuff.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 13 Mar 2009 13:05:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dreganius wrote on Sat, 07 March 2009 03:25My god, you just don't shut up, Spoony. I originally blamed you equally, and then you called that stupid, but the funny thing is that by saying that you're getting more and more off-topic which is exactly what I was on about.

So now you've just gone on about it proving me right even more.
Topicwise:

GET ON WITH IT!

So... by pointing out why you were absolutely dead wrong, I 'proved you right'.

OK... guess you graduated from the jerad grey school of non-logic. Either that or you're pathologically terrified of admitting you were wrong about something... it's also quite funny that you physically couldn't stop yourself replying, even though you haven't actually contributed anything to the debate at all.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [archerman](#) on Fri, 13 Mar 2009 14:32:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

madrackz wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 19:07The Bible is my Toilett Paper.

and you are the shit on that Toilett Paper.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Fri, 13 Mar 2009 17:51:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

lols

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 13 Mar 2009 18:59:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SUP DAWG I HERD U LIKE TO RAGE SO WE PUT SPOONY IN UR RELIGION DEBATE SO YOU CAN RAGE WHILE U PRAY

PRAAAAAAYGE!!!

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 14 Mar 2009 10:47:55 GMT

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

renalpha wrote on Sat, 07 March 2009 08:56 this topic should be stated by enormous bullshit. And therefore should be closed, in anyway you want to debate about how old the earth is, you should read the bible and darwins theory before you start discussing this stuff.

why ought anyone to read the bible as a prerequisite to debating the age of the earth? you may as well say you mustn't involve yourself in a debate on astronomy if you haven't seen Star Wars.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [Renx](#) on Sun, 15 Mar 2009 16:42:47 GMT

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

If you take the bible literally you're a moron.

food for thought:

<http://www.newscientist.com/blogs/shortsharpscience/2009/02/vatican-backs-darwin-dumps-cre.html>

http://cas.bellarmino.edu/tietjen/Resources/vatican_admits_galileo_correct.htm

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7399661.stm>

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article5705331.ece>

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [slosha](#) on Mon, 16 Mar 2009 04:32:57 GMT

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

To be honest, nobody knows 100%. These points can be argued either way in my opinion.

Science: There's no way they can be 100% sure because there was nobody around then, and our technology could be off.

Religion: Nobody can really prove that God, Buddha, or any other god or gods exist, because there is no proof. There is only faith.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [u6795](#) on Mon, 16 Mar 2009 18:44:42 GMT

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

People that waste their time forcing their beliefs onto others and defending them are morans.

/flamebait

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [slosha](#) on Fri, 27 Mar 2009 19:27:35 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 27 February 2009 10:16 Basic logic and common sense does..

It's totally ridiculous to think that one race of animal: Human, is so awesome as that they have their own place to go to after they die, apart from anything else in the entire universe. It's both highly ridiculous and makes humans look like total selfish, self promoting jerks..

Not just any form of ridiculous, I mean like squirrel cooking bacon ridiculous..

It really boggles the mind how selfish people can be...

I think you have it all wrong. Maybe there is a god, or there isn't, but everyone has to have something to believe in. Whether it be a god or not, believing in something is what keeps us going

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 27 Mar 2009 23:08:12 GMT

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

u6795 wrote on Mon, 16 March 2009 12:44 People that waste their time forcing their beliefs onto others and defending them are morans.

/flamebait

Would you say they are neckbearded morans?

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.

Posted by [u6795](#) on Sat, 28 Mar 2009 01:10:39 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 27 March 2009 19:08 u6795 wrote on Mon, 16 March 2009 12:44 People that waste their time forcing their beliefs onto others and defending them are morans.

/flamebait

Would you say they are neckbearded morans?
everywun on renegaid forumz iz a nekbearded moran.

Subject: Re: How old is our planet, and the effect this question has on the Bible.
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 28 Mar 2009 02:52:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not trying to force anyone's beliefs.. I'm just correcting the illogical statements people keep making.. like "our science can be off."

If you think that, then you don't know what science is. If you want an explanation, read my earlier posts that reply to that specific comment.
