

The "proof" from dependence is hidden in how religion tries to derive God as answer to, "Why is there something rather than nothing?"

The argument from necessity and causality these days take the form of, "Why is there something rather than nothing?" You could rephrase this as, "Why does the universe exist and why do we exist? Why isn't there simply just nothing?"

The argument for God's existence from necessity says that "God must be the reason for his own existence for we are not the reason we exist. This assumes that something cannot come from nothing. All things that exist do not need to exist therefore they must be created by a being that cannot not exist. And by a being that had to exist the same way as two and two have to be four. In other words, God's essence and his existence are one and the same. His nature is existence while existence and essence are not the same in other creatures (page 23, Reasons for Hope). For example, the stone is not its own existence but existence produces it. There can only be one being with the infinite power to be the cause of his own existence not two for two infinities cancel each other so there is only one necessary being or God."

Some prefer to call it the proof from dependence (page 7, Part 1, Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine) for it says that God is the only being that does not depend on anything to keep him in existence and that he made the universe for everything in it depends on something and he is the thing they ultimately depend on. God makes things and holds them in existence because they don't need to exist proving that they need to be sustained. The proof says that because nothing in the universe needs to exist it must have been made by a being that does need to exist: God.

The argument seems hard to understand. But it is not. If you suppose that there should be nothing, you could reason that something has been making sure there is NOT just nothing. The argument claims that something that always existed made that which does not need to exist and made something where there should be nothing.

Creation of things not out of anything means ...?

Believers in God say that everything has a cause and that something cannot come out of nothing. So they say that the cause of all is God and that he created all things out of nothing.

God is said to have created all things - he caused nothing to become something. Causing means that something that exists causes something else.

If God caused nothing to become something did he give nothing the power to become something? In this view, God makes the universe make itself. He makes nothing make the universe. This view indicates that the universe could make itself and that God may be superfluous.

If God caused nothing to become something did he work on nothing as opposed to giving nothing the power to work on itself? This is the standard Christian view.

This view has God working on nothing to turn it into something. The previous view has God working on nothing from outside it so that it can create the universe itself.

If something cannot come from nothing then both views are nonsense. Nothing cannot become anything for there is nothing there.

The notion of God giving nothing the power to make things looks far worse than the idea that he simply turned nothing into something. But in fact they are equally silly for they imply that nothing is nothing but how can it really be nothing if it can be worked on or turned into something? A God who can make things not out of anything certainly can give nothing the power to create something.