
Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 18:40:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 14:26 I've never said that my theory was any more likely than the other...it's just my feeling. What I do know is that the Big Bang can't be described by any of your current physics, but that we can measure how the galaxies moved away from each other over the years (with the theory of relativity) and that we know how long ago they were together very close and that it was extremely hot at that point. What we know as well is that dark energy exists and that the presumed dark matter is capable of pulling the universe back together...if you want to explain me how those aren't true in more simple terms, then good, if not take it to a professor of astronomy, since I just can't explain how the Big Bang, etc thoroughly works.

Since this argument depends on "dark matter" I'll start with that. We actually have no experimental evidence suggesting dark matter even exists. In fact, we've just called the astronomical anomalies of the universe out and said that whatever dark matter is, it's effecting them somehow. Astronomers are literally walking blind and making up possibilities based on assumptions that this unobserved matter and energy exist. Which is kind of silly, because this epistemological conundrum is exactly what you have used to suggest that a first cause doesn't need to exist.

Quote:BTW Explain to me in simple terms as well, how an unmoved mover can exist instead of spamming terms without explanation.

There are no simple terms to describe the transcendental idealism in the full. It literally (and I am not exaggerating this in any way) was one of the hardest concepts I've actually tried grasp and understand fully. The book alone, "critique of pure reason" by Kant took a solid year of reading and re-reading just to make sense of his logic; which by the end doesn't clusterfuck like many of the moderns today. The simplest and most concise way to describe it I've found is:

<http://www.bright.net/~jclarke/kant/element1.html>

It's a ridiculously condensed version of the conclusions drawn, and many of them are useless to comprehend without the text to back them up. Luckily for you, I provided the text for you before should it peek your curiosity.