

Why No Proof for God can work!

Christian apologist John Feinberg, "I wouldn't try to prove God's existence first, if at all, in that I am not convinced that any of the traditional arguments succeeds".

God means the loving creator who we can have a relationship with. Anything else is a creator not a God. Arguments from the universe that there must be a creator God are religious. The arguments say that nothing in the universe is independent but depends on something and that something is God and you see the evidence that God in his wisdom designed the universe. But arguments from the universe that there must be a creator are scientific. Science can have overlaps with some religious claims. Only the moral argument, the notion that we can have no reason to believe in right and wrong morally speaking unless there is a God of justice and love, is an argument for a God. The reasons at best prove a creator which is not the same thing. The only important argument for God is actually the moral one. It is the only essential. It does not work for if hypothetically God could not avoid being the kind of God that hurts babies for fun he would count as a moral God and as a victim. It is of no real use. The moral argument is also the only religious argument for God. A moral God seeks obedience. "I obey you for I love you" is a contradiction so this is not a God you can have a healthy relationship with.

If you love and sense that love made all things you don't need arguments for God. God is too much detail. It is really about sanctioning human ideas about the mystery that is existence. It is not as holy as it looks.

Professor Fish doesn't want God to be provable -

"The criticism made by atheists that the existence of God cannot be demonstrated is no criticism at all; for a God whose existence could be demonstrated wouldn't be a God; he would just be another object in the field of human vision."

The argument as good as suggests that if there is proof then God needs to hide it! You demonstrate the existence of your baby but that does not mean you in any way objectify her. The professor is just an example of a person who should know better and is so well educated and is still unable to override his religious prejudices. The argument is no good for a believer for an agnostic can have no problem with it either.

Proving God does not stop you having a relationship with him as opposed to seeing him just as another thing like other things. The argument is manipulative though popular among Christians. It is intended to deflect the argument, "God demands all our love and all relationships are really to be made out of our relationship with him. You need to be very sure there is a God before you can be expected to do that. But you cannot use evidence to show that God's existence is beyond all reasonable doubt."

Those who say that you don't need arguments for God for are in fact trying to silence arguments against God. If there are no arguments for God then there are none against either. Faith-based ideas are far more susceptible to regulation and critical analysis than other arguments for they are less evidence motivated. So faith without evidence is just a cheat and an attempt to forge an idol. As Paul Tillich said, any doctrine that protects itself by making criticism irrelevant and useless is an idol.

God is supposed to be rational. Hypothetically, say God's existence is demonstrable. Do Fish and others expect God to ensure that his existence cannot be demonstrated? If God does a miracle is he supposed to make it look like nothing out of the ordinary? Is he supposed to raise Jesus from the dead and then plant evidence that suggests Jesus never died at all? What would you think of a person who says that there is an intangible cow living in his kitchen and that the cow hides evidence of its existence? Would it not seem that the person just wants to believe this and to protect this belief from being seen as the silly nonsense it is? And why stop with cows and with God? Why not claim child benefit for your intangible children?

There are no problems with a demonstrable God. If there are, they are nothing compared to the problems with one who sets out to be non-demonstrable or who is non-demonstrable effortlessly.

People think the God belief is important for it helps us live good lives and makes us feel loved by him. But is something good because God commands it or does God command it because it is good? If something is good because God commands it then God can order us to commit child abuse and still be good. Christians deceitfully claim there is a third option, that God's nature is goodness itself. But this leads to the conclusion that God sees nothing as good unless he values it but his valuing it does not depend on it being good so we are back where we started. If God values something and doesn't care if it is good or not, then he is inventing good. If God commands things because they are good then goodness is independent of him and he cannot be God - he has no authority to command. For God to be God to us, he has to be needed. If good is independent of him then he is not needed. This paragraph is so basic that it entitles us to ignore alleged proofs for God.

The failure of the Christians to prove that God is good means that no proof for a good supreme being or God can work.

Religion realises that science has found no evidence that a divine intelligence is behind the seemingly designed universe we live in. It finds no evidence of divine activity. It can all be accounted for without positing a God. Religion says it doesn't care because science looks at the universe but God is not the universe or an object in the universe and his being undetectable does not mean he does not exist. It is lying for God is defined as an active force - God is activity and action. Science doesn't need to look for God as in object to be able to find God defined as action. Religion does not tell the whole story. It wants to fool the unwary.

GOD, THE FAILED HYPOTHESIS, HOW SCIENCE SHOWS THAT GOD DOES NOT EXIST, Victor J Stenger, Prometheus Books, New York, 2008

The Cambridge Companion to Atheism, Edited by Michael Martin, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2007

THE LANGUAGE OF BELIEF, A SCIENTIST PRESENTS EVIDENCE FOR BELIEF, Francis S Collins, Free Press, New York ,2006