

---

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 02:44:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's not reducing it down to simply "it could be nothing BUT God who caused this, therefore it is", but that is a tool that you can use to DEDUCE that conclusion. You've got to take a little bit from each way of thinking, do a vulcan mind meld, and come out with a theory that works (until it is successfully refuted).

As for the cause of God... Aquinas suggests that God is NOT caused. Hence "unmoved mover". There is no way (that I'm aware of) that you could explain HOW an unmoved mover can be scientifically explained, but you can most certainly posit that it can merely exist. That's the difference between the transcendental logic and aesthetic and the general logic you're applying when you're looking for a means to an ends. It's not as much just saying how He is as much as just saying THAT He is. That's not to say you can't try and figure out HOW He is, by all means. But it definately supports the argument THAT He is as opposed to that He is not.

---