

Re: slightly OT, but still connected

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-04/msg02801.html>

- *From:* "Cousin Ricky" <rickyusvi@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 28 Apr 2005 18:21:44 -0700
-

Clayton Doyles wrote:

- > On the other side of the coin, I don't see any evidence that the
- > universe is
- > really billions of years old.

Well, just because you don't see it doesn't mean that generations of scientific effort haven't seen it either.

- > We have two schools of thought here that are
- > similar in one way: both ages come from man. Man, through the
- > disciples,
- > wrote The Bible with Divine guidance;

For which we have only the say-so of the theologians who read the documents centuries after they were written, compiled, or spliced together.

- > and it has also been man who has
- > determined the age of the universe in the billions of years.

After looking at countless evidence.

- > Are we so
- > sure that radiocarbon and other methods of dating aren't invalid?

The weaknesses of radiocarbon dating were exposed a long time ago, and the method has since been recalibrated against samples of *known* age. Today, the method is *known* to be accurate for its domain.

Trouble is that its domain is only a few thousand years back, and only over articles that were once alive. When you use "age of the universe" and "radiocarbon" in the same argument, you only confirm what any scientist can deduce just by hearing your thesis: that you haven't done enough research to form a credible argument. Here's a start:

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/methuselah/>
<http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/faq-age-of-earth.html>

- > Are we so

Re: slightly OT, but still connected

> sure that The Bible is correct?

Those who are so sure that the Bible is correct cannot be convinced otherwise. I strongly recommend you stop courting them *now*, and move onto far easier pursuits—such as observing QSO 3C–273 in a 50mm refractor at high noon.

> The point is... no matter how you look at
> it, you must pick what you believe is the most correct and depend on
> man's
> correctness (or lack thereof).

Believing in the literal inerrancy of a document penned by man is to depend on man's correctness.

Believing in the concrete evidence standing in the world in front of you, or passing through a spectroscope from the sky above you is to depend not on man's correctness, but upon God's very universe.

Think about it.

> To me, there's just as much "evidence", if you will, that the
> universe is
> 6,000 years old that there is 20 billion and I remain unconvinced by
> the
> so-called evidence that it is anything but.

Oh. In other words, you in fact are one of the people that i warned you not to debate. Sorry. My mistake.

(That'll teach me not to read the whole article before i press Reply.)

> However, that is my "belief"
> just as you must "believe" that it's 20 billion.
>
> Davoud wrote:
>> Mainstream Christians, both Protestant and Catholic,
>> have long since come to terms with the fact that the Universe is
>> about
>> 14 billion years old, and the Earth about 4.5 byo.
>
> Not necessarily.

Y'know, speaking of Catholics, your talk about picking our beliefs is exactly the sort of relativism that Pope Benedict XVI has condemned. You've now lost credibility with me not only as a scientist, but as a Christian. Time for me to hunt for that ancient Tasco; QSO 3C–273 awaits!

(Double challenge since, at this time of year, i'd have to look through 12,000 km of rock in order to see 3C–273 during the daytime.)

Re: slightly OT, but still connected

Clear skies!

----- Richard Callwood III -----
~ U.S. Virgin Islands ~ USDA zone 11 ~ 18.3N, 64.9W ~
~ eastern Massachusetts ~ USDA zone 6 (1992-95) ~
----- <http://cac.uvi.edu/staff/rc3/> -----

• **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: slightly OT, but still connected**
◇ From: Clayton Doyles

• **References:**

- ◆ **slightly OT, but still connected**
◇ From: Pierre Vandevenne
- ◆ **Re: slightly OT, but still connected**
◇ From: Davoud
- ◆ **Re: slightly OT, but still connected**
◇ From: Clayton Doyles

- Prev by Date: **Re: Uti telescopes, expensive??**
- Next by Date: **Re: John Edwards=John Edmund=John Patterson=John Jacobson=John Shuttlebower=Ryan Walters???**
- Previous by thread: **Re: slightly OT, but still connected**
- Next by thread: **Re: slightly OT, but still connected**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**