

## Re: and who made god?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-10/1332.html>

---

**From:** Ryan Tanaka (*yidijm\_at\_hotmail.com*)

**Date:** 10/29/04

Date: 29 Oct 2004 09:53:50 -0700

redafroeclipse@aol.com (King John II the Good) wrote in message news:<f301b05.0410281257.1fa6fd61@posting.google.com>...

Of course, in reality, it could be very well that the structure of the how our world operates and its beauty has only been shown to us thanks to our greater understanding of science.

While God is used to explain the beauty of nature, it is also used frequently to explain away things which we do not understand, which is a reflection of ignorance, not structure. This is particularly true, in hindsight, in how we as human beings used to think. And let's be honest here; we believed in a lot of stupid things back in the day, a lot of which we attributed to God in one way or another. So like you said, arguing for or against the idea of an omnipotent being is useless, much in the same way of having a preference over it in one way or another, since believing in either direction serves no functional purpose whatsoever.

I don't really see any reason why Darwinism and the concept of God cannot exist together, since there are enough holes in scientific theories that there will always be something that we can attribute to the unknown. But do we, as human beings, give up on trying to figure these things out, or do we passively let the church dictate what we think, even though it intself is a man-made creation?

Ryan

--

<http://www.ryanttanaka.com>

> > I think that the alteration of the definition of the term "God",  
> > changing ever so subtly through the millennia, only illustrates how  
> > the human understanding of the universe has changed. God seems to  
> > have been a metaphor, or reflection, of whatever humanity thought  
> > about it's environment from the very beginning, IMO.

>

> That's an interesting point, however it depends how you look at it.  
> One can say that as the world progresses man's understanding of God  
> deepens; for God is an infinitely complex being and understanding God  
> is an endless process.

>

> You know, it's easy to say that God is just a fantasy, a being

Re: and who made god?

## sci.logic: Re: and who made god?

> created to satiate man's need for certainty. There are many  
> understandings of God, and its unlikely that you are not committed to  
> any of them. One can say: all that God is, is the cause of the Big  
> Bang, the one who's creativity, knowledge, and power is great enough  
> to calculate exactly what is necessary to create the world as we know  
> it. Or, God can be emotions, the "soul" the spirit that drives us to  
> feel emotions. However saying that there is no meta-physical being  
> that planned man's creation, seems almost impossible when looking  
> closely at the world.  
>  
> The Theological argument describes how the completion of the world  
> is so great that there must be some ultimate creator. When one looks  
> at nature, human beings, animals, and such things, they see the world  
> as such a fantastically beautiful and complicated thing that it is  
> impossible that it occurred by chance. Arguing for, or against the  
> existence of God is stupid and futile for it is circular. However,  
> when looking at the almost infinite depth of the Universe, its  
> virtually unbreakable rules of Nature that seem to animate the  
> inanimate, and the underlying pattern of it all, I get a true honest  
> feeling that some sort of conscious being must of created it.