

WE WOULD KNOW ALL IF THERE IS A GOD

To be truly free, God should implant the truth in us. This would not be tampering with our free will but helping us to use our freedom better. And we could still be free to reject the implanted truth. True free will needs to be in line with reality. Errors and mistakes detract from your freedom.

We know very little. Knowing is being literally certain.

A lot of confusion is put out into the world by people watering down what knowing means. They say they know things when they do not know them and when they merely feel that they know them.

The wife who says she knows her husband will not cheat on her does not know it in the strict sense of the word but in a loose sense.

If you say you know something when it cannot be true you prove yourself to be a liar.

Usually what happens is that people develop a theory and follow it and live it out and then they decide that the theory makes sense in their lives and experience. They think the proof of the goodness of the pudding is in taking a bite of it. They then think they have confirmed the theory. They think that they know the truth of the theory. But that means that one person will claim that she knows that her religion was founded by God while another person with a very different religion will claim his is the true religion of God.

If there is a God we could know everything or more than what we know now for he knows everything. He can make infinite space so he can make minds for us that can hold infinite or all knowledge. He can expand our minds to hold infinite knowledge. He exists for a reason and if we are too unintelligent to understand the reason and prove him he can enable us to.

The Bible and the Church have always said that we will know all when we enter Heaven for we will see God as he is and all will be uncovered and proven. God is a real being so he can make it possible for us to see him and know him and enjoy him forever. God is perfect good and the human will only goes after what it thinks is good. Even evil is just misperceived good. So we would want God. So then when we are with him, we will freely become good and will never sin again for we will be so glad to see and be one with God. And our wisdom will be perfect. Jesus said that the pure in heart will see God and the First Epistle of John promises that we will be like God for we shall see him as he is.

Should we know or be able to prove everything about God? If we have to make sacrifices and mistakes then no. There would be nobody to help if everybody knew what to do. But if mistakes are good then it is because they cause discipline for us. But this leads to the view that the more mistakes the better which is plainly unacceptable. The teacher who doesn't show the kids how to paint but leaves them to find their own way is not doing her job.

So, should we know and therefore have proof for everything about God?

Religionists say no for God should not prove his existence to us. There is more sacrifice in suffering for a being you think may or probably exists than for one you are sure does exist. That is utter garbage for if you love a being it does not matter how sure you are that he exists. You might not do as much for a being you are doubtful of but you have a reason for that – uncertainty - so it does not mean you love him any less for you are loving him as much as you think you should and as much as you can. It is better for you and others and the being to love a being you are sure is out there than one you are less sure of. To defend God by saying he is right not to prove everything is to advocate self-degradation and to say he hates us and himself. How can you love God when you hate yourself which means hating the power to give yourself in love? You would be trying to offer something hateful to God and thereby hating him yourself!

The more uncertain you are that God exists the more immoral it is to listen to religion and obey it except in those things that no decent person would oppose. God must be against religion and unity when he eludes proof.

We do not understand and prove God completely therefore there is no God. The argument of St Anselm stands refuted for it says that once you understand God you see that he must exist. If the argument were right everybody would understand God in the first place so there would be no need for an Anselm to come along to convince us armed with his ontological argument – that dishonestly ignores the unsolvable problem of evil and seeks a proof two sentences long that refuses to look at all the pros and cons - if that is what it is.

Miracles would show that God is evil and deceptive in offering us scraps instead of what we are entitled to.

I am sure of my existence more than his and he wants to come first according to Moses and Jesus. He does not want to come first if he is fair so Moses and Jesus lied when they said he does. It cannot be any other way for he cannot prove his existence to me as clearly as I can know my own existence. If he cannot prove his existence and still wants to come first, he is unreasonable and evil and incompetent.

Let us answer the theistic claim that atheists would need to know everything in order to be sure there was no God. There are four answers to this.

One, says that there is no evidence or no sufficient evidence for God so that is enough to justify atheism.

Two, says that God is an incoherent concept and so simply cannot exist.

Three, that the existence of evil proves that there cannot be an all good God. I would add that the kind of evil that exists which makes us biased towards sin is proof there can't be a God.

Four, the existence of non-believers indicates that God cannot exist because he should be able to make us see that he exists for he makes us see plenty of other things. The existence of God is a very big claim. Because it implies a miracle-working being or one that might do miracles you need extraordinary evidence for it. The more outrageous the claim the more evidence you need for it for it is so unusual. Christians argue that we believe the man down the road won billions on the lottery even though that is a pretty outrageous and unlikely claim. But that depends on the source. If it is in the newspaper then it is true. If a child tells you about the win on the street then you are wise to withhold belief for a while until you find out the truth. Lotto wins are possible. But wonders like God and miracles – at best we don't know if they are possible. The two situations are entirely different. If we are going to use other people's evidence and testimony for God and miracles, then we will have to believe in ghost stories and fairies for there are plenty of unrefuted testimonies for them too which we don't need to do with lotto wins and non-supernatural strange and unbelievable occurrences. That way then we deny that anything is outrageous and needs extraordinary evidence and who wants to start saying that?

Moreover to say there is a God is to boast that he is helping you to become a good person for that follows from God being God.

The answer I would make is as follows. You do not need to know everything to know you exist. You are your own God for what you are most sure of comes first. Therefore there cannot be a God outside you. Yes, if there is a being of infinite power and glory and goodness, he is God but not your God for you are your own and he has to understand that. God will accept us if we are sincere atheists if he is good. Therefore the ones that have to do the proving are not the atheists. The ones that have to do the proving are the believers. THEY are the ones that have to know everything for they say it matters if God is believed in while we say it does not and we do not believe. And when they asks us to put so much at stake for God although they don't – the God principle commands that we suffer all ills for him and fight for him and be generally unhappy – they must be claiming to know it all. They would need to, to justify all that fanaticism.