

---

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 17:42:04 GMT

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

---

mrpirate wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 11:15

Java: I think I get now what your argument is, although if there's more to it that hasn't been touched upon in this thread then never mind this. However, as you stated yourself, there is a stretch between saying that there was an initial cause to the universe, and saying that this cause is the god so many religions are so wound up over.

The difference, as far as I'm concerned, is that the religions who get so wound up are the same religions that starting defining characteristics of God they, as human beings, could never possibly know. That being said, I don't contend that the God I'm arguing for the sake of is the same God as the Bible, Koran, Buddha, or whatever.

He (personified, even though I can't prove yet that He can be called a pronoun accurately) simply is the initial force that allowed all things to come into essence. I'm currently writing up a thesis on transcendental causality which would point precisely to everything I haven't explained or have left as a loose thread. Doitle's in on the idea too and we were going to try and work it all out and present a concise, logical necessity for a God who at the very fundamental level exists. It doesn't rely on faith or any sort of abstract, for lack of a better word, bullshit, but rather a coherent and highly plausible explanation that the existentialists can't refute, or refute easily.

---