

## **When religion says the argument points to God but does not prove**

A system of morals and belief that holds to unproven principles must be held to a stricter standard than one that has proven ones.

A system of morals and belief that holds to unproven rules must be held to a stricter standard than one that has proven ones.

A system of unproven principles is worse than one with unproven rules for principles matter more than rules and rules have no authority if the principles are misguided.

A lot of criticism and testing is needed.

It is said that if there is no God there is no such thing as right and wrong in moral terms. Religion says that and gets a lot of respect and power from saying it.

The argument makes an assumption. It presupposes that an ontological realm of morality that is independent of human experience and opinion exists. To assume that from the outset and then say this shows there is a God is not only dangerously assuming morality is wholly independent of any human experience and opinion, but begging the question. You are guessing what you pretend to prove. While morality should be bigger than what people think, this is not to say that what we need to think should not be a consideration in working out a morality.

Some may judge the Nazi Holocaust and different unspeakable atrocities and blame God. That is saying that God is bad or useless. Others will settle for saying there cannot be a God. Saying morality has nothing to do with what we think but is just out there like a fact says our judgement does not matter. But it clearly does. But notice that if God is bad you can say he may have power but is not fit to be called a God for he is so flawed. So those calling God bad and atheists will feel the same way.

Sometimes believers say the moral argument is an indication or evidence that God exists but not a proof. It is a pointer. If morality does not prove that God is there then the reason must be that morality is a brute fact. It is just true and needs no justification. For that reason it cannot prove God. It is not enough to justify belief in God.

Christians usually say the moral argument points to God but does not prove him. This contradicts the belief of many that God and morality are a unity and you cannot believe in one without believing in the other. But morality is not for believing in. It is a fact that we must be moral even if we are not sure how.

They are saying the moral argument could be wrong.

They say that objective morality is undeniable - it is certain that it exists.

But if it might indicate the existence of God, then it might not as well.

So objective morality is more certain than God.

So it is better to deny the existence of God than to deny the existence of objective morality.

There are some supporters of the argument who say that the argument is uncertain because both objective morality and God are not provable or totally certain. They think they are equally uncertain.

If they are that unsure that objective morality exists is it really a big deal then if somebody denies that it exists? No. We will continue to do the things that help us fit in reasonably okay with society even if our intention is not to be moral. For example, we will not rob old ladies in public.

If they are that unsure that God exists is it really a big deal then if somebody denies that he exists? No.

Which one are you best off denying? Obviously God!

Anyway, objective morality can be recognised and can exist without God. That is another reason why it is important and God is not. In comparison to it, God does not really matter.

Some teachers of religion give the impression that you can believe in an objective morality without God but you believe properly and give morality its due honour the best by believing in God. It is like morality becomes "more" objective when you believe. That is nonsense. If morality is a fact it is a fact and there is no such thing as a truth being 60% or whatever the truth. It is true or false. The notion that you cannot really revere objective morality without faith in God is far worse.

The moral problems of putting forward the God is objective morality argument need to be given great importance.

We have seen that believers do not consider the moral argument conclusive.

Is it right to base something as important as moral values on an argument that could be wrong?

Is it right to fuse morality and God when God is too unfeeling to have a relationship with?

The answers are "No".

Human nature does not need a God like the Christian one who is outside time and is a spirit. He is not a material entity with feelings. He cannot be surprised or have a sense of humour for he knows all things even the future. Morality involves celebrating our wellbeing and our fun and our humour and this God does not relate to it.

If it were true that morality and God go together, it would also be true that they do not. The doctrine is incoherent. It is self-refuting. You might have to live with the paradox or contradiction but you cannot go around pretending there is no paradox or contradiction. And religion does pretend. It contradicts its own standards of honesty with its lies.

One reason why objective morality systems are seen as bigoted is that religion says that once you disbelieve in God you end up with no ground for morality. That is a lie. Many atheists think objective moral values are nonsense but they never argue, "God does not exist therefore there are no moral values." They reject moral values as being real for other reasons. Many in fact drop God and then search for years for ways to ground objective morality. They would assert that if there is a God or if there is not, the matter has nothing to do with ethics or morals. God whether fact or fiction is simply irrelevant to the objective morality question. One could say that objective morality needs to be grounded and we have to keep trying to find a way if there is no current way to do it. The atheist who is in search of this ground but dismisses God as a help should not be condemned.

To say morality points to God but not for definite is to agree with the atheist that we should keep searching and that we cannot have objective morality even if we cannot be sure why.

The real motive is shown how arguers for morality and God being in some way one and the same trot out the bad results that supposedly come from thinking it is up to us to create morality. They say that unless there is a God to make morality final and its principles unchangeable - eg killing for ethnic reasons is always wrong that we have and can end up justifying any evil. If morality is relative the way is paved for Nazi atrocities. The argument actually refutes absolute or fixed moral principles because it wants you to lie to yourself as follows: "If A is true then B will happen. B is bad therefore A must be false." It replaces one form of moral relativism with another - one that is shamelessly pro-lies. It is no safeguard against Nazi holocausts but their precursor.

If morality is a fact it can be a fact without God. If God makes it a fact that only means he makes it a fact not that he necessarily has to. It is uncertain that God has done that.