

FINDING NEW DISPROOFS OF THE BELIEVABILITY OF GOD AND MIRACLES FROM DAVID HUME'S PHILOSOPHY OF MORAL SCEPTICISM

The philosopher David Hume was famous for saying miracles true or not are not believable. True and believable are two different things.

You might say that some miracles that don't seem to want to be believable mean that we should not believe. You can use miracles as evidence that you should not believe.

Hume also claimed to show that morality is not the great believable or certain thing it is made out to be. If so I would add it shows miracles are lying to us when they appeal for faith in a loving God who gives moral commands or who in some way is the same thing as moral values such as love and compassion and justice.

Even if God is not morality the fact remains that to debunk morality is by definition to debunk God as well. Or to find that morality is less clear or less useful than we are led to think is to make God not be God. If he is too unclear to guide us or be guidance then he cannot be the being who should be at the heart of all we do. We cannot "love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, mind etc". God by definition is that which alone ultimately matters for all that is good comes from him.

Hume says an is does not imply an ought. A person with athletic prowess does not mean they should have it or use it. And what about dispositions such as being unfriendly or friendly or kind and unkind? The same applies. You cannot see how it is a rule that you must be kind just because you can be kind.

The fact is that people who agree with Hume are still motivating themselves by treating an is like an ought. It is human nature to do that.

Hume noticed that though people claim to take free will as in uncaused actions or self-created actions that you bring from nothing seriously, the reality is that they do not. They are lying to themselves. They treat you as something predictable to a large extent.

However the exception is how each person thinks he or she has this free will and takes that seriously but does not afford the same privilege to anybody else. You like to feel you can do what you want and even turn into a serial killer as if your goodness in the past has no influence. But that is not how you think of others.

Your devotion to the idea of free will and this form of selfishness show that you should not be able to say, "If there is no free will there is no morality or morality is made less important" with a straight face. Your version of free will is selfish so how can it be a reliable ground of justice and love.

Hume how said that we cannot assume that every action is somehow selfish or basically self-centred. He advises to go by "the obvious appearance of things." That is to say that if a man lifts a bomb to save others and gets blown up then use him as an example of selflessness and caring.

This is only a practical rule not a moral one. He did say an ought cannot be made the same as an is for they are two different kind of statements.

For Kant morality is only morality when good deeds are done out of a sense of duty and obligation. Hume thinks that duty does not make an act truly good. An act then is good because nothing and not even a sense of duty is prompting you. It just is pure generous.

For Hume, goodness is not a duty but a habit. The good person is not one who does the duty but the one who does good without thinking almost as a force of habit.

Religion turns into a habit as does fervour for miracles and Masses. Yet it is about duty. None of this makes sense. Religion and the things related to it such as prayer and miracles are incoherent.

We conclude then that Hume if he had teased out the implications of some things he wrote could have come up with more refutations of the credibility of miracles and God.