

# **The Argument against God, through Science.**

**By**

**Joshua Michail**

**1 November 2017**



**Premise 1** – Science is defined as the methodical experimental search of tangible evidence which grants natural explanations for observed phenomenon. Science operates by making predictions about certain likely events under certain conditions with certain stimuli, and then proceeds to test the hypothesis to see if the prediction is false or not. When numerous independent experiments have consistently yielded the same, or predicted results, that hypothesis becomes more and more reliable.

**Premise 2** – All technological advances which have been most successful are necessarily dependent upon the validity of, and an adequate comprehension of, the current state of scientific knowledge. (At least, that understanding must exist in the person inventing or innovating the technology in the relevant fields of science to whatever the particular technology example one considers.)

**Premise 3** – That which is conjectured to exist outside of nature would be beyond the capacity for comprehension, and outside the scope, of scientific endeavor and knowledge. (The fact that science is concerned solely with natural explanations for observed phenomenon means that which could be unnatural, or outside of nature, would necessarily be more than just *terra incognita* to science – it would necessarily be impossible to scientifically understand.)

**Premise 4** – Supernatural is defined as that which might be beyond or outside of nature. Anything outside of the sphere of what is natural could not be understood through science, by definition. Gods, angels, demons, the afterlife, ghosts, etcetera are all considered to be supernatural concepts – they are asserted to exist, by those who believe in them, beyond natural explanations. They are concepts of things which might exist outside of the laws of nature.

**Premise 5** – Since all technology necessarily depends on the accuracy and reliability of scientific endeavors and knowledge, every piece of technology can only be as strong as the principles in science which underlie its design.

**Premise 6** – If supernatural forces were able to influence natural phenomenon then natural explanations would become unreliable. Predictions would be hit-and-miss almost, for all intents and purposes, at random. One cannot, after all, predict a god's whim. If things beyond our understanding, beyond our capacity to ever understand, can influence our world and our lives, then things beyond our capacity for understanding can influence the reasoning of any kind of mind which might exist outside of nature. It would not matter all that much if we appease such a supernatural force in order to sway how it will influence our universe because it could have also stubbed its toe and be in a bad mood and take it out on us – and, for that matter, how would we really know how to properly appease such a force?

**Inference:** If supernatural forces can influence the natural universe then scientific understanding would be unreliable and thus technology, particularly the more complex it is, would become unreliable and ultimately pointless. If a god can make airplanes fly, by her will alone, then clunky extremely heavy not-at-all aerodynamic designs would fly beautifully and the most elegant lightweight aerodynamic designs would not even get off the ground – we'd have no way of knowing what would work and what wouldn't. Supernatural influence in the natural universe would necessarily negate all scientific knowledge and there is just no way around this fact.

**Conclusion:** Because our technology works, and our scientific understanding of the universe is quite reliable, it is reasonable to say that there cannot be any force outside of nature which influences the universe in which we live. This must be the case because if there were forces outside of nature (supernatural) which influenced our natural universe then all technology would spontaneously, inexplicably, randomly dematerialize or vanish into thin air, all the time. (Even, for instance, the bonds between atoms would be in question at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances. Our understanding of how atoms and molecules hold together would be unreliable and so things like television sets would just fall apart at some random timing, leaving perhaps nothing but a dusty pile of plastics, metals, and glass molecules where the TV once stood.)

### **Arguer's Caveats:**

1. We do not, and cannot, know, not only whether there are any supernatural forces at all, but that there is no god. For all we could know it might be possible, though extremely unlikely, that there's anything like a god. All we can say is that it's obvious that if there are such things they cannot influence our universe.
2. If one is inclined to take the Deist religious philosophy, one could say it's possible a god of some sort set into a course of events something which would result in the birth of our universe, however no god would be able to interfere in our universe.
3. If one were to take the view that we, and our universe, were some sort of Sims-esque computer simulation, then perhaps the same laws of nature which apply to us apply also to the programmers who created this conjectural simulation in which we find ourselves, conjecturally speaking. Or perhaps once they set up the laws of nature in our program they cannot alter them, under any circumstances. If this were all true, then it seems likely our conjectured programmers would not want to interfere in our universe anyway and perhaps they'd be sophisticated enough to set locks on the programming so they couldn't even intentionally, let alone accidentally, alter a set of values. After all, if you're running a simulation and you tweak some variables mid-run then you directed the outcome and negated any intent to see what would happen.
4. Scientists do not argue against god, at least not while speaking as a scientist. I want to be clear that science, in and of itself, is not anti-religion, nor is science pro-religion. I am using science for my argument, but nothing in science says there cannot be a god of some kind – the body scientific takes no position on the question of god. The scientific view is only that supernatural claims lie outside the purview of science.
5. I am arguing philosophically, not as a scientist. My argument is intended to be logical and philosophical in nature.