

## Re: and who made god?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-01/1469.html>

---

**From:** Barb Knox (*see\_at\_sig.below*)

**Date:** 01/18/05

Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2005 17:42:35 +1300

In article <sf\_Gd.21942\$ql2.9625@okepread04>, Albert <albertwagner@cox.net> wrote:

>Barb Knox wrote:

>> In article <HnQGd.21913\$ql2.17595@okepread04>,

>> Albert <albertwagner@cox.net> wrote:

>>>Anthony Cerrato wrote:

>> [snip]

>>>>it is "pretend science" designed for misdirection to Creationism.

>>>

>>>No, it is not. You display your ignorance here in arbitrarily

>>>grouping all who notice the scientific discoveries regarding the

>>>statistical improbability of our Universe as Creationism adherents.

>>

>> The statistical improbability of our sort of universe

>

>Our sort? What sort is that?

The sort hospitable to intelligent life (such as us), as I say below.

>> is thoroughly irrelevant,

>

>Irrelevant to what?

To the existence or not of a personal creator of it.

>> since if the universe were not hospitable to intelligent life

>> then we would not be having this discussion.

>

>How profound! I suppose you think you have actually said something.

I reckon, since it seems you still don't understand my point. Maybe I wasn't clear enough.

>> The fact that this discussion

>> is occurring at all drastically constrains the sort of universe in which it

>> occurs.

>

sci.logic: Re: and who made god?

>I fail to see how current existence could have constrained the  
>the development of constants at the beginning in any way.

It didn't, obviously.

>> This is the "weak anthropic principle".

>No. It is your attempt to explain away the highly improbable fact  
>of your existence as some sort of scientific necessity.

Please read what I actually wrote. I do not claim my existence is any sort of necessary fact, but it does happen to be a (contingent) fact. Given that fact, the universe I find myself in must be one which supports life such as myself. So any argument that the fact that the universe appears fine-tuned for our sort of life actually means something more is thoroughly bogus.

Let me put it in terms of conditional probabilities: Let's posit that the probability of the existence of our sort of universe is very close to 0. But, the probability of its existence GIVEN THAT we are in fact here is 1.

Ad the late Douglas Adams so succinctly put it:

[I]magine a puddle waking up one morning and thinking, "... interesting hole I find myself in — fits me rather neatly, doesn't it? ... must have been made to have me in it."

--

```
-----  
|   BBB           b   \  
|  B B   aa      rrr  b  
|  BBB   a a    r    bbb  
|  B B   a a    r    b b  
|  BBB   aa a   r    bbb  
-----
```

Barbara at LivingHistory stop co stop uk  
Quidquid latine dictum sit,  
altum viditur.