**Philip Goff chose not to reply to my email where I challenged the assertions**

**(made by both he and Steven Novella) re: the “fine-tuning” of the universe.**

**I will now address the reply sent by Novella (his comments are in italics).**

**==============================================**

***I think you missed the point of the discussion.***

**Actually, I am quite aware of the point of the discussion.**

**The point of my email was to address**

**the pseudoscientific hypothesis that the universe is “fine-tuned.”**

***First - that the universe is fine-tuned for life,***

**Nice assertion.**

**When you lack evidence, simply assert and ... voilà! ... problem solved!**

***that the constants are determined by random,***

**See previous reply.**

***and only a tiny subset of arrangements allow for the possibility of life***

***was assumed for the purpose of a hypothetical discussion,***

**Red flags: “assumed” and “hypothetical.”**

**Also, no matter how many subsets exist that allow for the possibility of life,**

**they are irrelevant as to whether or not our universe was “fine-tuned.”**

***which focused entirely on the logic of***

***the inverse gamblers fallacy vs the lottery fallacy.***

**As I struggled through your monotonous dual circle jerk it became boringly obvious where the focus was. What is clear, is that the focus was not ...**

**where it should have been.**

**(Readers: I regret that egoistic reply. Here is what I should have written:**

**“If it were focused entirely on those fallacies, I wouldn’t have replied**

**with questions regarding the unsupported assertions that I read.”)**

***So most of your points are moot.***

**Whatever points you think I was trying to make by asking for evidence,**

**your attempt to peremptorily dismiss what you cannot refute**

**is an admission that your bazooka ... is out of ammo.**

***These were hypothetical assumptions,***

***which I did make clear at the beginning of the discussion.***

**I asked for evidence to support your hypothetical assumptions.**

**Did I ever receive any? From either Goff or you?**

**(hint: I believe that answer is “No”).**

***Further, fine-tuned for life does not mean hospitable for life.***

***It means life is possible.***

**Which one of these 2 definitions are you claiming support “your” definition?**

[**https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fine-tuned**](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fine-tuned)

**According to what you’ve written, the answer is ... neither one.**

**Redefining words in a desperate attempt to make them come out**

**the way you need them to come out ... is very “unskeptical.”**

**Since you like hypotheticals so much, try this one:**

**You pay someone $500 to fine-tune your guitar.**

**When you get it back you discover that**

**the strings only produce the correct note about once every 100 plucks.**

**You demand your money back claiming that your guitar is not fine-tuned.**

**He then uses *your* definition and tells you that fine-tuning doesn’t mean**

**hospitable for music – it only means that it is possible to get a correct note.**

***Most configurations of the constants don't allow for a universe to exist***

***for more than a few seconds, so no time for complex anything to evolve.***

***Or atoms can't exist, etc. That is what is meant.***

**Line#1 of *your* article makes it clear that Goff was referring to *our* universe.**

**You had no answer to my statement (which mirrors the scientific consensus)**

**about the formation of atoms 380,000 years after the Big Bang.**

**But you didn’t want to be accused of ignoring,**

**that which you could not refute,**

**so you felt pressured to respond to it.**

**Rather than admit that you had no rebuttal,**

**you chose to bury it in the middle of the nonsensical word salad above,**

**to give the false impression that you addressed it.**

***The post-hoc fallacy of the puddle is irrelevant to the discussion.***

**Once again you’ve resorted to peremptory dismissal when you have no reply.**

**I find Adams’ puddle extremely relevant, as it paints a clear picture showing how illogical, factually-unsupported thinking ... can distort rational thought.**