

## Re: and who made god?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-01/1516.html>

---

**From:** Albert (*albertwagner\_at\_cox.net*)

**Date:** 01/18/05

Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2005 11:57:24 -0600

Barb Knox wrote:

> *Albert wrote:*

>

>>*Barb Knox wrote:*

>>

>>>*Albert 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.*

Should have been said /above/ to avoid my question.

>>>*is thoroughly irrelevant,*

>>>

>>>*Irrelevant to what?*

>>>

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

OK. But, where did you get the idea that I was making that argument? Perhaps you jumped in unprepared by not reading the previous posts that put my statements in context:

"[Tony groups] all who notice the scientific discoveries regarding the statistical improbability of our Universe as Creationism adherents."

sci.logic: Re: and who made god?

>>>*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.*

Maybe so. Perhaps you can clarify how your statement(s) above addressed my statement in context, i.e. anyone who notices what science has said about the improbability of our Universe is a Creationism adherent.

>>>*The fact that this discussion  
>>>is occurring at all drastically constrains the sort of universe in which it  
>>>occurs.*  
>>  
>>*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.*

Then you have constructed an ambiguous sentence above: "The fact that this discussion is occurring at all drastically constrains the sort of universe in which it occurs."

Perhaps you meant to say: "The fact that this discussion is occurring at all, drastically constrains /the discussion concerning the sort of universe in which we exist/."

>>>*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.*

And I assume that you will do likewise.

> *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 far, so good.

> *So any argument that the fact that the universe appears fine-tuned  
> for our sort of life actually means something more is thoroughly bogus.*

I never claimed that appearances actually mean anything more. I assume that your phrase 'actually means' is synonymous with 'is

Re: and who made god?

proof.'

Note the context of my statements:

-----  
Albert wrote:

There is no "theory of 'intelligent design'" and nothing can be disproved concerning the idea of 'intelligent design', certainly not by 'very simple arguments.'

Tony wrote:

it is NOT science, nor in any way, scientific---

Albert wrote:

Yet, it is /reasonable/ to view the evidence for 'intelligent design' and make the statement that perhaps it is true.

- 
- >
  - > *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.*

OK. But I think you are arguing with yourself, in that I never claimed otherwise.

- >
- > *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."*

Cute. But Douglas Adams, although entertaining, does not, in this quote, address the issue either.

In summary, what you should have been replying to way \*my\* point:

It is /reasonable/ to view the evidence (there is no proof) for 'intelligent design', specifically the /appearance/ of 'fine tuning', and make the statement that perhaps it is true. And furthermore, such a statement does not in any way place one in the category of creationism adherent.

--  
"Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it."  
-- George Orwell as Syme in "1984"