

Re: and who made god?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-02/0539.html>

From: |-|erc (h_at_r.c)

Date: 02/06/05

Date: Sun, 6 Feb 2005 15:45:59 +1000

"Barb Knox" <see@sig.below> wrote in

>

> *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.*

That is complete and utter sh*t.

When you find an object, its a straight forward scientific procedure to determine if its designed or a random conglomeration. The Universe itself is not void from scientific evaluation.

If you came across a set of physical constants that had arbitrary values, and the very function of biological life relied on a slim window of those settings, 1 in 1000 tolerance for 100 variables, then you can form theories on how BIOLOGY influenced PHYSICS even before it manifested.

for example. if gravity was twice as strong, NO LIFE, if gravity was twice as weak NO LIFE. gravity could have been any value from 1 1,000,000th what it is to 1,000,000 times what it is, protein muscle systems can only handle a few G maximum to carry a 1 litre brain, enough for humanlike awareness. Life will not evolve on planets much larger than Earth. AND life will not appear on smaller planets like Mars because the G is too weak to hold an atmosphere.

So not only are YOU ALIVE Barb, but you're standing on a narrow ledge of existence.

We could have ALL THE RICH CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS today, but if one simple physical behaviour like OSMOSIS didn't work, NO LIFE! No water could travel up stems of plants, without osmosis, just bacteria level life throughout the universe.

Barb is up to her usual deplorable arguments here, sticks her fingers in her ears and says that's proof she's a product of science. Classic strawman argument from blind atheists.

Herc