

I was asked to use scientific method and reason to prove the Soul does NOT exist.

The truth about any existence is uncomfortably unconfirmable, for example “I think therefore I am but I am not my thoughts” (The paradox regarding our own existence) – currently all consensus about any claim of knowledge is questionable because there is no confirmable **single point of truth**.

Until you find **the** single point of truth, everything we understand (I mean Everything) is questionable, and why would you want to move forward from this understanding using best guesses (ancient and elaborate as they may be). Are you willing to settle for second best knowledge?

Should we not **work together** to *prove* the *Truth* does *exist* if this will benefit humankind? (I use the term “prove” lightly)

The best understanding I have of truth is that when two or more people wholeheartedly and truly agree on a topic, we like to call that the truth. This is somewhat vague, so humans developed the scientific method; at the core of scientific proof is this definition: Observability, testability, repeatability, and falsifiability are the hallmarks of the scientific method... Simply, for a single point of truth to exist **we** must be able to observe and test repeat performance.

As we cannot observe and test the soul in repeat performance, it scientifically and technically does not exist. Thus, I have proven as defined by the scientific method and by using reasoning that the soul does not exist.

You may argue that there is a metaphysical connectedness or presence of an unobservable energy within species that you and I should explore more, but that’s not proof that the soul exists, and some might say this mode of thinking is irrational.

Do you agree?

You will need to disprove the argument above by proving that someone possess a single point of truth, and then prove that the scientific method can in fact expose truth for any claim that the soul exists to have any substance. In my opinion, consensus, including scientific consensus is always questionable and humans are not legitimately progressing until a single point of truth is identified. We will one day need to start again from scratch – distinguishing good from bad, answering the chicken and the egg OR unifying all dichotomies, like a marriage.

If you wish to take an abstract approach to this (abstract is not one of the parameters of our argument), you could claim that all language is fallible, my argument is a paradox and my words are meaningless because I do not have a single point of truth – our argument would then be a stalemate.

If you really want to challenge your mind, stop arguing on Facebook and seek truth, when you realise that you’re actually a lost puppy chasing your tail (I’ve been there too) – you’ll eventually find my organisation. We haven’t perfected everything but we do ground-breaking work and welcome big “egos.”

www.thecentreforpeace.com.au

To deduce or reduce that is the question? Use both to win arguments.