

Mathematical Proof That God Does Not Exist

Mathematical Proof That God Does Not Exist

Downloaded from [template-dev.mobaptist.org](#) by *Mohammad & Shertyn*

INTRODUCTION: THE INTERSECTION OF MATHEMATICS AND THEOLOGY

The quest to prove or disprove the existence of God has occupied humanity for millennia. Philosophers, theologians, and scientists have debated this question using logic, evidence, and faith. In recent centuries, some thinkers have attempted to apply the rigorous framework of mathematics to this age-old question. While no mathematical proof can fully capture the metaphysical or spiritual reality of a divine being, several formal and informal arguments have been proposed that attempt to demonstrate, through logical and mathematical reasoning, that the concept of God is contradictory or improbable. This article explores the concept of a "mathematical proof that God does not exist," examining the arguments, their logical foundations, and their philosophical implications. It is crucial to understand that these are not proofs in the empirical sense, but rather logical exercises that highlight the limits of human reasoning when applied to the infinite.

THE PROBLEM: CAN MATHEMATICS PROVE A NEGATIVE?

Before delving into specific arguments, it is essential to address a fundamental epistemological question: can mathematics prove a negative existential claim, such as "God does not exist?" In mathematics, we can prove that certain objects do not exist by demonstrating a contradiction. For example, we can prove that there is no largest prime number or no rational number whose square is 2. These are proofs of non-existence within a defined axiomatic system. The challenge with God is that the subject is not as clearly defined as a mathematical object. Different religions and philosophies have vastly different conceptions of God, making it difficult to pin down a single, universally accepted definition for mathematical analysis. Therefore, any "mathematical proof" against God's existence is only as strong as the definition of God it assumes.

THE ARGUMENT FROM INCOMPLETENESS: GÖDEL'S LEGACY

Understanding Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems

Kurt Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems, published in 1931, are among the most significant mathematical results of the 20th century. The first theorem states that any consistent formal system that is sufficiently rich to express basic arithmetic contains true statements that cannot be proven within the system. The second theorem states that such a system cannot prove its own consistency. Some thinkers have attempted to apply these theorems to the concept of God, arguing that if God is defined as an omniscient being who knows all truths, then by Gödel's theorem, there will always be truths that God cannot know because they are unprovable. This would imply a limitation on God's omniscience, thus contradicting the definition of an all-knowing deity.

Counterarguments and Criticisms

This argument has been heavily criticized. First, Gödel's theorems apply to formal axiomatic systems, not to minds or beings. God is not a formal system. Second, the notion of "truth" in Gödel's theorems is syntactic truth within a system, not metaphysical or absolute truth. An omniscient being could know all truths, including those that are unprovable within a given system. The argument conflates provability with knowledge. Therefore, while intellectually fascinating, the Gödelian argument is not a convincing mathematical proof that God does not exist. It does, however, challenge the idea that God's knowledge can be fully captured by any finite system of logic.

THE ARGUMENT FROM PROBABILITY: THE IMPROBABILITY OF A PERFECT BEING

Applying Bayesian Reasoning

Some thinkers have attempted to use probability theory, specifically Bayesian inference, to argue that the existence of a perfect, omnipotent, and omnibenevolent God is highly improbable given the observed evil and suffering in the world. The argument goes: if God were all-good, He would want to prevent evil; if He were all-powerful, He would be able to prevent evil. Yet evil exists. Therefore, the probability of such a God existing, given the evidence of evil, is extremely low. Mathematically, we can frame this using Bayes' theorem: $P(\text{God}|\text{Evil})$ is much smaller than $P(\text{God})$ alone.

Limitations of Probabilistic Arguments

This is not a pure mathematical proof but a probabilistic inference. Critics argue that we do not have a reliable prior probability for God's existence to plug into the equation. Furthermore, the concept of "evil" is subjective, and the argument assumes that we can understand God's motives. Perhaps God has a morally sufficient reason for allowing evil, such as preserving free will or creating a world where moral growth is possible. Probability

arguments are also sensitive to the choice of priors, making them less rigorous than formal mathematical proofs. While interesting, these arguments are more philosophical than mathematical.

THE ARGUMENT FROM SET THEORY: THE PARADOX OF OMNIPOTENCE

Can God Create a Stone He Cannot Lift?

One of the most famous logical paradoxes related to God's omnipotence is the "stone paradox." Can God create a stone so heavy that He cannot lift it? If He can create it, then He cannot lift it, meaning He is not omnipotent. If He cannot create it, then He is also not omnipotent. This appears to show that the concept of omnipotence is logically contradictory. Set theory offers a formal way to think about this. If we consider the set of all tasks that an omnipotent being can perform, the paradox suggests that this set cannot be consistently defined. This is reminiscent of Russell's paradox, which shows that the set of all sets that do not contain themselves leads to a contradiction.

Resolutions and Refinements

Most theologians and philosophers have resolved this paradox by refining the definition of omnipotence. Omnipotence does not mean the ability to do logically impossible things, such as creating a square circle or a married bachelor. Creating a stone too heavy for an omnipotent being to lift is a logically incoherent task, akin to a square circle. Therefore, God's inability to perform logically impossible acts is not a limitation on His power but a reflection of the laws of logic. Thus, the stone paradox does not constitute a mathematical proof against God's existence but rather forces a more careful definition of divine attributes. It highlights the importance of logical consistency in theological discourse.

THE ARGUMENT FROM INFINITY: PARADOXES OF THE INFINITE

Hilbert's Hotel and the Nature of Infinity

Georg Cantor's work on transfinite numbers and the nature of infinity has also been used in arguments about God. The concept of an infinite being, such as God, raises mathematical questions. For example, if God is infinite, can there be multiple infinite beings? The mathematical study of cardinals shows that there are different sizes of infinity. If God is the greatest conceivable being, what is the cardinality of His greatness? Some argue that the mathematical properties of infinity lead to paradoxes when applied to a personal deity. Hilbert's Hotel, a famous thought experiment, illustrates the counterintuitive nature of infinite sets. Critics argue that an infinite being would have to possess an infinite number of attributes, which could be contradictory.

Objections and Theological Perspectives

These arguments are often seen as category errors. Infinity in mathematics is a concept about sets and numbers, not a property of a conscious being. Theologians like Augustine and Aquinas argued that God is not "infinite" in the mathematical sense of having an infinite number of parts, but rather infinite in the sense of being unlimited or perfect. The mathematical paradoxes of infinity do not necessarily apply to a simple, non-composite, eternal being. Therefore, while the mathematics of infinity is fascinating, it does not provide a clear disproof of God's existence.

THE ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN: THE REVERSE PROBABILITY

Fine-Tuning and the Multiverse Hypothesis

The fine-tuning argument suggests that the physical constants of the universe are so precisely set for life that they point to a designer. Mathematically, one could try to calculate the probability of these constants having their observed values by chance. Some have used this to argue for God. However, a mathematical proof against God could turn this around: if the universe is fine-tuned for life, and if life involves suffering, then the probability of a good God creating such a universe is low. Alternatively, the multiverse hypothesis, which is a mathematical consequence of certain cosmological theories, suggests that there are many universes with different constants, making our fine-tuned universe a matter of statistical necessity, not design. This does not prove God does not exist, but it provides a naturalistic alternative.

The Problem of Evil Revisited Mathematically

One could attempt a more formal mathematical formulation of the problem of evil. Let us define the expected utility of creating a universe. If God is perfectly good, He would create a universe with maximum positive utility and minimum negative utility. Given the existence of immense suffering, one could argue that the observed utility of our universe is not maximal. This is a moral argument, not a mathematical one, but it can be expressed in utilitarian calculus. The challenge is quantifying utility and accounting for unknown variables, such as an afterlife or long-term divine purposes. No formal mathematical proof can resolve this, as it relies on value judgments.

THE ARGUMENT FROM INCONSISTENT REVELATIONS: A LOGICAL AND STATISTICAL ISSUE

The Problem of Multiple Claimants

Another argument relates to the vast number of mutually exclusive religious claims about God. If God exists and desires to be known, why are there so many contradictory revelations? Mathematically, we can think of this as a problem of hypothesis testing. If there are N distinct, mutually exclusive religions, each claiming to be true, the prior probability of any one being correct is $1/N$. Given that N is very large, the probability of any specific religion being true is very low. While this does not disprove God's existence, it does lower the probability of any particular conception of God being accurate. This is more of a statistical or probabilistic argument than a formal mathematical proof.

Limitations and Responses

This argument assumes that all religions are equally likely, which is not necessarily the case. It also assumes that God would only reveal Himself through one channel. Some theological frameworks allow for multiple paths to the same divine truth. Furthermore, the argument does not address deism or the existence of a generic creator who does not intervene. It is a challenge to specific religious claims, not to the existence of a divine being per se.

CONCLUSION: THE LIMITS OF MATHEMATICAL REASONING

After examining the various arguments that fall under the umbrella of a "mathematical proof that God does not exist," it is clear that no such definitive proof exists. The arguments presented—from incompleteness, probability, set theory, infinity, and design—are fascinating intellectual exercises that challenge simplistic notions of God and force a more rigorous examination of theological concepts. However, they all suffer from fundamental limitations: they rely on specific definitions of God that may not be accepted by all believers; they conflate mathematical concepts with metaphysical realities; or they are probabilistic rather than deductive. Mathematics is a powerful tool for understanding the natural world, but it has inherent limits when applied to the supernatural. The question of God's existence ultimately lies beyond the scope of purely mathematical reasoning, touching on faith, experience, and philosophy. While mathematics can illuminate contradictions in certain models of God, it cannot close the case on the divine. The search for meaning and truth must continue across multiple domains of human inquiry.