

## The "How"

“Why is there something rather than nothing?”

There is no reason to think the question should be, “Why is there something rather than nothing?” That is going further than we need to. A God might create us for no purpose. An impersonal God might do that. Impersonal beings don’t have purposes. So the question should be, "How is there something rather than nothing?" "Why is there something rather than nothing?" is a LEADING question. It assumes that a personal god is behind all reality.

To ask why is not to ask why so much as how.

There is no point in asking why if you do not ask how first.

How has to tell you if there is a why.

Religion doesn’t want any attention drawn to that for it teaches that our existence is a result of the miracle of creation worked by God and you cannot make sense of miracles but just observe them. You cannot explain how God does them. You cannot answer the question, “How is there something rather than nothing?” by saying it’s a miracle. If God creates out of nothing then he makes  $0 = 1$ . He changes the laws of mathematics and so God can create a stone that is too heavy for God to lift. Miracle isn’t an answer. It would be more honest if the answer was, “It isn’t logical.”  $1+1$  can be  $= 3$  with this miracle scenario. The answer miracle is meaningless. It is like answering, “What is the Buddha?” with “Ten pounds of flax”.

So if you are going to bring in God and miracles then the best thing is not to try and answer the question at all. Just hold that you are not intelligent enough to answer it and leave it at that. Trying to answer it only takes us into danger and illogic or unreason. But at least we can show that the God answer is the worst answer.

Science cares about the how and so it should. It searches for natural and rational answers.

Richard Dawkins insists that there are only "how" questions.

Religion denies that he is right. They say that the whys are important too.

Does why matter more than how? We know that it cannot.

They are not equal in relation to God for nobody knows how a God can create.

So if the why is important it is not as important as the how.

Thus religion and science are in conflict. Thus science is in principle better than religion and more worthy of respect.

Science assumes that the universe can be understood at least in principle. So it says the universe is rational. This looks like faith. But it is not religious faith if it is. And science does not just say, "We must assume the universe is rational." It says, "The universe is rational for experiments show that it is." The assumption part has long been left behind.

If God is irrational and full of magic then God and science are intrinsically opposed. Science should ask the how not religion.

We conclude that “Why is there something rather than nothing?” is only a distraction. The real question is “HOW is there something rather than nothing?”