

THE MIRACLE OF THEISM

Arguments for and against the existence of God

HM484 Modern European Philosophy - Group3

November 30, 2021

201801152: Mihir Doshi
201801160: Daksh Trivedi
201801166: Rushi Patel
201801172: Jainit Patel
201801178: Janvi Patel
201801179: Mann Gondaliya
201801180: Tulsi Shah

201801183: Raj Desai
201801188: Chirag Gupta
201801189: Umesh Savaliya
201801194: Kunj Paraskar
201801195: Meet Parmar
201801202: Pratham Dhruv

Introduction

The main theme of this book is theism and to give and discuss rationally the arguments for and against the existence of god and in particular a god as conceived in the central tradition of the main monotheistic religions. The main aspect of traditional theism is the existence of god without a body, present everywhere, the creator and sustainer of the universe, a free agent able to do everything. God is thought to sustain the universe in that it continues to exist only because he wants, if he does not wish for it it would cease to exist. If we assume that central assertions of theism are literally meaningful, it must also be admitted that they are not directly verified or verifiable, hence John Locke rightly insisted that revelation needs the support of reason.

Today the advancements in science makes all the supernatural explanations of natural calamities redundant but these are still likely to prevail as there are psychological and social forces to maintain it.

In this we come across certain technical terms like statistical probability. It is simply the frequency in a finite class in an indefinitely extended series. A priori is using facts or principles to decide the probable effects or result of something and a posteriori is a term applied to knowledge considered to be true based on experience, observation, or existing data.

The book starts with the traditional arguments for theism in chapters 1 to 8 and then goes on to deal with more characteristically modern approaches and ways of defending theism in chapters 10 to 14. Chapter 9 discusses one of the major problems for theism, that of evil, the paradox of omnipotence and the free will defense.

1 Miracles and Testimony

1.1 Summary

In this chapter we can see that author is using Hume's argument for testimony of Miracles and also modifying a bit wherever needed. So Hume made two types of arguments for anyone to believe that miracle actually happened named Primary and Secondary arguments. Here miracles are referred to as violation of the law of nature made purposefully by some deity. For example making someone back to life after being dead for 7 days without any life support. So in his primary arguments he says that for miracle to occur it must violate the basic laws of nature. So for any event named as miracle is either really a miracle or it is according to the laws of nature. Now the laws of nature can be certain or probabilistic, in case of certain we can determine the next state of the system based on the given initial state but in case of probabilistic whatever events occur with high probability are general events but there is also high probability of some rare events which occur after interval of time but they are not miracles. Now if a claimed event has violated laws of nature then its unlikelihood is measured along with the unlikelihood of the testimony of the miracle. Now we reject the higher likelihood with confidence equal to the difference of both unlikelihood. Here the author has made some improvements in the original argument and made three cases. So either the unlikelihood of the testimony is lower as compared to the unlikelihood of miracle in this case we simply reject the miracle or unlikelihood of

the miracle is lower as compared to the unlikelihood of testimony in this case we simply reject the testimony or unlikelihood of both events are same in that case we suspend the judgement and wait for the further evidence.

Secondary clauses of Hume

- Well-attested miracles do not exist.
- Positive tendency of the human mind to believe what is strange and marvelous in an extreme degree.
- Reports of miracles are observed chiefly to abound among ignorant and barbarous nations and where civilized people believe, it is found that they receive from ignorant and barbarous ancestors.
- Conflict between religions. Nowadays due to the rise of atheist and skeptical bodies all religions toned down their hostility. We worship the same god with different names and ways.
- The very fact that a miracle story is used to introduce a new religion or to support an existing one is an additional reason for skepticism.

1.II Key ideas and sentences

- The usual purpose of the stories of miracles is to establish the authority of the particular figures who perform them or are associated with them
- An argument from miracles is that an argument whose main premises is that such and such remarkable events have occurred and whose conclusion is that a god of a traditional sort both exists and intervenes from time to time in the ordinary world.
- According to author, Hume does not expect the popular belief in supernatural to die out but he expects rational criticism from wise and learned
- In a religious context credulity is often thought to be meritorious, while doubt or critical caution is felt to be sinful
- If someone tells you something, you are in general disposed to believe him, but why? Why should you give credence at all to what he says?
- The plain consequence is that no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsity would be more miraculous than the fact, which it endeavours to establish; and even in that case there is mutual destruction of arguments and the superior only gives assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior.
- If the force of testimony is pretty strong though not strong enough to make it reasonable for us to accept the miracle report it will significantly lower the degree of confidence with which we reject it.
- There is an intellectual sympathy by which we tend automatically to share what we find to be someone else's belief, analogous to sympathy in the original sense, the tendency to share what we see to be someone else's feelings.
- Hume's case against miracles is an epistemological argument: it does not try to show that miracle never do happen or never could happen, but only that we never have good reasons for believing that they have happened.
- Something such that there is a strong propensity or tendency for it not to happen we still can not firmly say that the laws of nature have been violated: laws of this sort explicitly allow that what is extremely improbable may occasionally come about. Indeed it is highly probable that some events each of which is very improbable will occur at rare intervals.
- The likelihood or unlikelihood the epistemic probability or improbability is always relative to some body of information and may change if additional information comes in.

1.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Miracle: Here miracles are referred to as violation of the law of nature made purposefully by some deity. For example making someone back through a spiritual way to life after being dead for 7 days without any life support. But someone who is in a coma for 5-10 years and comes back to life with all body functioning is not considered to be a miracle because there is always a small probability for this event to occur.

A priori probability (Epistemic Probability): A priori probability, commonly referred to as classical probability, is a probability derived from formal reasoning. A priori probability, in other words, is obtained from rationally considering an occurrence. A priori probability is an objective probability that does not differ from person to person (as subjective probability does). For example: A fair six-sided dice is rolled. In a dice roll, what is the a priori probability of rolling a 2 or 6? There are two desirable results (rolling a 2 or 6) and a total of six outcomes. For this case, the a priori probability is determined as follows: $\text{Probability (a priori)} = 2 / 6 = 33.33$

Likelihood: Likelihood is the probability in a distribution given the event has already occurred, with a specific mean and standard deviation.

Laws of Nature: These laws define the behaviour of the system(universe) , through these laws we will be able to determine the next state of the system. These laws are called basic laws. Through these basic laws of nature we can define some complex laws called derived laws.

2 Descartes and the Idea of God

2.I Summary

In chap 2 Author explores and discusses the third meditation of Descartes. Hume was joking when he said religious belief is self-certifying. Some philosophers take this seriously and try to prove it. Anyone who has an idea or notion of God is thereby in possession of something that could have come from no source other than God. Therefore no other proof of reality is required. In the third argument, Descartes presents an argument of this sort.

God's existence is the central part of Descartes's system of knowledge. Descartes was dissatisfied with the system of learning of his time. He wants to eliminate doctrines that do not have a good claim to their foundation.

For Descartes, knowledge of the sort that can serve as a foundation for science requires certainty, which in turn requires indubitability namely. He wants to re-established the system on a secure foundation.

For this, he developed a method of Doubt, rejecting anything that could be doubted at all and reaching some proposition that was proof against skepticism.

Descartes built the foundation in several ways. Firstly, he inferred that whose existence he had established was essentially a thinking thing, that is, mind, whose essence is thinking, and it is different from body and matter. Secondly, he inferred that clear and distinct perception would be in all cases a criterion of truth. Thirdly, he argues that there exists a God who is an infinitely perfect being, who therefore cannot be a deceiver.

In the proof of the existence of God, Descartes seems to rely upon several things which he claims clearly and distinctly to perceive. But elsewhere, he seems to argue for the reliability of his clear and distinct premises that there is a God who cannot be a deceiver.

Descartes's general rule that all that is very clearly and distinctly apprehended is true, he derived this general rule from Cogito argument, which is seen to owe its conclusiveness. There might be the possibility of a deceitful deity that might make general rule wrong. Therefore the existence of God needs to be investigated, whether there is a deity and, if so, of what sort.

Descartes saw very "clearly and distinctly" that to think, one must exist. But how does he know that clear and distinct perception is always reliable? E.g., how does he know that "triangles have three sides" if there's an evil demon deceiving him? There is no way that an all-good being would make it so that when he "clearly and distinctly" thinks something to be true that it wouldn't be true.

Descartes thought about non deceitful deity. But its independent authority is incomplete because there might be a chance of a deceitful deity. God might be a deceiver: God could have made Descartes have many false beliefs. That's possible. How then can Descartes be sure that he can trust any of his other beliefs besides the belief of his own existence?

Therefore Descartes' views are not proof against all possibilities of skepticism. The arguments by which Descartes advances from the cogito are not secure against the radical doubt. Therefore, his re-establishment of knowledge on an unshakable foundation fails.

Descarte also said there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in its effect. He distinguishes the formal reality of an extra mental thing from the objective reality of the mind. The objective

reality of some ideas may have come from combining old ones. And some ideas may have their objective reality from the subjective reality of some extra mental thing. Descartes draws an important distinction between secondary properties such as heat, color, and taste on the one hand and primary qualities as size, shape, and texture on the other hand.

Being a thinking thing, Descartes knows that he has ideas. He notices that one of these ideas is the idea of God, i.e., something eternal, infinite, all-knowing, all-powerful, all-good, and the creator of all things. But where did he get this idea of God, a perfect being? Did he invent it? Did it come from other people? No. His idea of God could only have come from God.

The general principle on Descartes' relying is that things do not spring into existence from anywhere. What exists must have an adequate cause. Descartes dictum there is as much as reality in total cause as in effect. We have no rational guarantee apart from experience. This general principle applies to the idea or mental thing in two ways. 1 - What produced it or how it came about. 2 - From where its content is derived.

Descartes believed that all features in our mental content are derived from our mental content or corresponding external reality, but without there being real external quality. The author believed that the Idea of God must be innate in him, implemented in his mind by extra-mental things, maybe God.

According to Descartes, a cause must be at least as real or perfect as its effect. However, the idea of God represents much more reality and perfection than the idea of himself, or of anything else. There's only then one possible cause: God. So, God exists. This is Descartes' causal argument for God's existence. The finite mind cannot comprehend the infinite. The objective reality of the idea must have come from something that has a similar degree either formally or eminently.

The author also said that Descartes is aware of the most serious objection, which is the Idea of perfection or Infinity that he has is not an adequate one. The concept of Desire develops along with the satisfaction of fulfillment but of ordinary certification, not a perfect counterpart of it. Similarly, the concept of a doubt developed along with the knowledge but again of ordinary knowledge. So, there might be the prior concept of perfection for the awareness of such imperfections.

Descartes asked how I could know that I doubt, desire, and am not perfect if I possessed no idea of being more perfect than myself. The author gave an answer to this question.

The concept of Desire develops along with the certification but an ordinary certification and fulfillment not with some perfect counterpart of this. Similarly, the concept of doubt develops along with the knowledge but with ordinary incomplete knowledge, not of omniscience. The main argument of the 3rd meditation fails, and it fails independently of any doubt.

2.II Key ideas and sentences

- Things do not spring into existence from anywhere. What exists must have an adequate cause.
- There is as much as reality in total cause as in effect. A cause must be at least as real or perfect as its effect.
- The objective reality of some ideas may have come from combining old ones. And some idea may have their objective reality from the subjective reality of some extra mental thing.
- Descartes inferred that whose existence he had established was essentially a thinking thing, that is, mind.
- God's existence is the central part of Descartes's system of knowledge.
- Descartes' views are not proof against all possibilities of skepticism.
- The finite mind cannot comprehend the infinite. The objective reality of the idea must have come from something that has a similar degree, either formally or eminently.

2.III Glossary of Important Concepts

"I think. Therefore I am" : This statement serves as the foundation for knowledge for Descartes in the face of radical doubt. It implies that while other knowledge could be a figment of imagination, deception, or mistake, the very act of doubting one's own existence served as proof of the reality of one's own mind; there must be a thinking entity (or self) for there to be thought.

Method of Doubt : In this method rejecting anything that could be doubted at all and reaching some proposition that was proof against skepticism.

3 Ontological Arguments

3.1 Summary

Descartes's ontological proof of God

Descartes has mentioned the cosmological proof of God in his 3rd meditation, in the 5th meditation he has given an ontological proof of God. Descartes starts by stating that God is a perfect being. Anything to be identified as some kind of thing has to have a nature or essence of that kind. For example, if we consider a triangle, then its nature has many properties that have to be satisfied to be called a triangle, namely the sum of angles is 180, 3 sides, and 3 angles. Now for a polygon to be identified as a triangle, it has to have the nature of a triangle. Similarly, Descartes considers existence as a part of the nature of a perfect being. If a thing fails to exist then according to Descartes it will not be a perfect being. So, as God is perfect, God exists. He also compared God without existence with a mountain without a valley. Even for a theist it was hard to accept this proof, it cannot be as easy as this to prove the reality of a God.

From Descartes's argument, he considers existence being a very nature of God and by saying "God does not exist" is like saying "The existing such and such does not exist". From the latter statement, we can say that it is self-contradictory, which can't be true. So, "God does not exist" is false, hence God does exist. If proving would be that easy then we can prove any imaginary thing to have an existence. This led to many criticisms against the statement, one of the most popular was Kant's criticism. Descartes's reply was that he has this conception of infinite perfections and has existence as a part of it and he cannot conceive God without existence.

Kant's criticism

Kant makes a number of separate criticisms against the ontological proof. In the first one he claims that contradiction exists if we reject predicate while retaining the subject, but if we reject subject and predicate alike, there is nothing left that can be contradicted. In simple words, let's assume God is perfect and existence is a part of nature/essence of being perfect, now if I say "God does not exist" then it may be contradictory as I am rejecting that God has no existence while saying God is perfect. It's like saying "Triangle does not have 3 angles" or "God is not omnipotence". But if I reject the subject itself like saying "There is no God", here I am rejecting the very subject of a God. So, this can't be a self-contradictory.

In his second claim, Kant argued that the alleged contradiction is between professing that he/she is inquiring whether God exists or not and considering the concept of existence as a part of nature of infinitely perfect being, into the description of what would count as God. According to Kant, one should not presuppose that a God exists as a proof for the existence of God.

In his third criticism, Kant defines a border between analytic and synthetic judgements. He said that the predicate of existence cannot be rejected without contradiction for analytic propositions. For example, there does not exist a prime number between 90 to 100, this statement can be proven wrong by other arithmetic methods.

Kant's most influential criticism is his fourth. He attacks the ontological proof by considering "existence" not being a predicate. If something doesn't add anything to the concept of a thing or doesn't describe one of its properties, then it's not a part of that thing's nature/essence. Now, let's say "The God is omnipotent", predicate here is omnipotent which adds something to the concept of the one who is supposed to be called a God. For the statement "God exists", exists is grammatically the same predicate as omnipotent but serves a different role. It doesn't add anything to the concept of a God, it just says that there is someone who is present in the real world. Hence, to say a thing exists doesn't change or add something to its concept, so existence is not a part of the essence of that thing. The question arises that what is "exists" if not a predicate? The universal accepted answer was that it's an existential quantifier.

Kant's arguments point out that it is impossible to have an ontological proof. The author considers this an ad hominem criticism. Further to dive deeper the author supposes some general term 'X' such that Xness explicitly or implicitly requires existence and allow as per Descartes's claim that there is some objectively necessary unity that holds together existence with other components of Xness. The author's arguments goes as follows:

- "The X does not exist" is a self-contradictory sentence.
- Statements such as "There are no Xs" in which we are relying on the fact that we have existential quantifiers (its language equivalents i.e. "There are..."), without denying the fact that "exists" can be a predicate of an individual. It's an open inquiry that whether or not X is there, if it is there then as per its essence : it exists.

- Now it may be a question that “if there is a X then will it necessarily exist ?” , but we can say for certain that it’s false when there is no X.

Kant sums up by saying that to ascribe existence to the object, we must go outside it. As shown above according to Descartes, if we suppose object does contain existence as a part of its nature still we must go outside of it to ascribe its existence, that is there is a question which still arises that “whether there is a X or not?” And to this question still we can pass a judgement that “there is no X” which cannot be contradictory.

Anselm’s Ontological Proof

Anselm presented his own ontological proof of God. Anselm’s own personal belief did not depend on it, but preceded it while his critic Gaunilo believed in God and still rejected the proof. Anselm’s supposed atheistic opponent is identified with “the fool”. Anselm’s argument goes as follows :

- He defined God using the phrase “a being than which nothing greater can be conceived”. Which implies God is the greatest being that one can conceive in mind.
- Things can exist only in our mind as imaginations or can also exist in reality, things that exist in reality are always greater than things that only exist as our imaginations.
- Hence, if God only existed in our imaginations, he wouldn’t be the greatest thing that we can think of, because God in reality would be better. Hence, God must exist.

According to the author Anselm fails to prove his assumption that existence helps to constitute greatness and is required for maximal greatness. This assumption of him was similar to Descartes assumption that existence is a component of infinite perfection.

Gaunilo’s Criticism

Gaunilo had criticised Anselm’s proof although he presumably believed in God, starting off by writing ‘On behalf of the fool’ . Considering Anselm’s proof as valid, he proved the existence of the imaginary ‘lost island’ that is the best island such that no other island can be conceived better than it. His point was that we can prove any imaginary thing if we are considering Anselm’s proof as valid.

To this Anselm replied that the sequence of Gaunilo’s reasoning is not the same as Anselm. There is a significant difference between his proof and Gaunilo’s proof, which can be understood from the addendum “cannot be conceived not to exist”. It phrases as “a being than which nothing greater can be conceived cannot be conceived not to exist”. As a lost island is something we can conceive which cannot exist , but God or a being which is greatest of all must exist else it will not be the greatest. This reply was according to the author better and coherent than Descartes’s response.

After Anselm’s reply , still the discussion merely repeats itself on a higher level. We can still say that there is not a being which cannot be conceived not to exist. Hence, it can be illustrated from Kant’s final dictum that “ Whatever, and however much, our concept of an object may contain, we must go outside it , if we are to ascribe existence of an object”.

Plantinga’s Ontological Proof

Avan Plantinga’s ontological proof makes use of modal logic, whereby a system of possible but non - actual worlds is taken to give the appropriate semantics for statements about possibility and necessity, the truth-value of any such statement being determined by what holds in various possible worlds.

Plantinga differentiates between ‘maximal greatness’ and ‘maximal excellence’. A being who has maximal excellence in one world may not have maximum excellence in every possible worlds (may also does not exist in other worlds), while a being who has maximal greatness has maximal excellence in every logically possible world, hence in this world also. So, being with maximal greatness will exist in every possible world hence in this world also.

Plantinga’s argument is as follows:

- A being having maximal excellence in a given logically possible world W will be omnipotent, omniscient and will have moral perfection.
- A being who has maximal excellence in every possible world, has maximal greatness.
- It is possible that there is a being that has maximal greatness in some world. Hence, it exists in every possible world.

- It exists in every possible world , then it exists in our actual world.
- Hence, a maximally great being exists.

Plantinga considered the possibility of a being that has maximal greatness in some world as a Premise. There is also a possibility that there is no such being with maximal greatness in any world. Both the cases are opposite to each other and have equal possibility. For the first case, the requirement is that a maximally great and excellent being should exist in every possible world, as compared to this, in second case , there can be maximally excellent in some worlds, is less restrictive according to the Author. None of the cases could be proven impossible.

3.II Key ideas and sentences

- God is a perfect being, who is infinite, independent, omniscient, omnipotent, etc. No other being can be conceived who is better than God.
- Things that exist in reality are always greater than things that only exist in our imagination.
- God is the greatest thing that we can think of.
- Whatever our concept of an object may contain, we must get out of it to attribute the existence of an object.
- There can be multiple logically possible worlds, with all worlds different from each other.

3.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Perfect being: According to Descartes, a perfect being has infinite perfection in every aspect. He/She is omnipotent, omnibenevolent, omniscient, etc. Descartes considers God as a perfect being.

Martian: An intelligent creature native to the planet Mars. “Remartian” term is used to define a real Martian, who includes existence as a part of its meaning.

a priori: Rationalism holds that at least some human knowledge is gained through a priori (prior to experience). A priori can be defined as rational insight as distinct from sense experience.

Analytic judgments: Analytic judgments are those whose predicates are entirely contained in their subjects; because they add nothing to our understanding of the subject, they are purely explicative and can be deduced from the principle of noncontradiction.

Synthetic judgements: Synthetic judgments are those in which the predicates are completely different from the subjects to which they must be shown to be related through some real connection outside of the concepts themselves. As a result, synthetic judgments are genuinely informative, but they should be justified by reference to some outside principle.

Reductio ad absurdum: A method to prove the falsity of a premise by showing that its logical consequences are contradictory or absurd.

Ad hominem: Attacking/Criticising a concept or a person, rather than its arguments or statements.

Maximal excellence: According to Plantinga, being with maximal excellence has omniscience, omnipotence, and moral perfection. This definition of Plantinga’s includes all the perfections which Descartes considered in a perfect being.

Maximal greatness: Being with maximal excellence in every logically possible world.

Modal logic: Logical reasoning that involves using expressions “necessarily” and “possibly”.

3.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

- Many arguments revolved around the idea of God being a perfect entity, one of them is the famous ontological proof by Descartes where he considered existence as a part of being perfect, hence “God doesn’t exist” is a self contradictory statement.
- Kant’s criticism also considered the premise of existence as a part of perfect being(God) , he considered the statement “There is no God” not being self contradictory.
- Kant’s most influential criticism was that existence cannot be a predicate or a part of anything’s essence. Existence can be considered a universal quantifier. We must think outside of the object, if we are to ascribe its existence.
- God is the greatest thing we can think of, God must be real to be greatest ,hence God must exist. This argument by Anselm is similar to Descartes’s proof but provided something more to it.

- If we can prove the existence of God using the proof given by Anselm, we can similarly prove the existence of any imaginary things. This criticism was argued by Gaunilo.
- If there is a maximally great being existing in one world, then he will exist in every possible world. This argument was presented by Plantinga.

4 Berkeley's God and Immaterial Realism

4.1 Summary

In this chapter, the author discusses how we can explain reality or whatever we see and perceive. For that, he explains two different philosophies. Material realism and immaterial realism (idealism of Berkeley). Here, the author tries to see which one gives a better explanation of reality.

Berkeley's Theism - exposition

Argument:- All that exists are minds and ideas and ideas are entities that God holds which exist in and by being perceived

Berkeley gives support to traditional doctrines that God has created the world and also sustains it. In this section, the author explains the idealism given by Berkeley.

According to Berkeley, objects are the collection of ideas. All the objects that humans can see are the only collections of ideas that are being perceived in their minds. In other words, objects are just mental contents or intentional objects or sensible objects. He denies the existence of a material world. For this, Berkeley argues that an external world is inconceivable. Suppose there is a tree in a park. It is the human mind that imagines this inside mind. Therefore we don't have any connection with the external world or can't conceive what is outside of human mind.

Now the problem is if all the things that exist are just ideas then the whole world is just an illusion. Then what is reality?. To answer this objection, Berkeley says that ideas can be divided into two categories. First is the former (ideas of sense) and the second is Illusions. The former are independent of the perceiver's will, which are produced and excited in our mind by God, constitute reality. The Ideas of sense follow the law of nature. Now the ideas only exist by being perceived. So we can say that an object exists if and only if someone perceives it. So now the problem is, suppose there is a tree which is not perceived by any human mind and will not exist, but it exists. To answer this question, Berkeley says that a tree will exist, though any human mind doesn't perceive it because it is being perceived by the mind of God. This is called immaterial realism. God has given some amount of independence to the human mind. Due to this independence, humans can imagine things (dreams, hallucinations, etc.) that are not there because of God's will, which forms illusions. In this unusual way, Berkeley tries to prove the existence of God.

There are some problems with Berkeley's beliefs. One can say that there are minds which are not conceived by me. Thus it will create solipsism. Now suppose there is a red box. The redness that I perceive does not belong to any object but how I perceive it. So It creates scepticism with regard to the material world. To eliminate scepticism and support his theism, Berkeley uses the Lockean primary (dimensions, motion, etc. which can resemble the idea about an object or related to direct perception) and secondary qualities (taste, temperature, color, etc. which produces the sensation or related to indirect perception). The basic difference between them is that primary qualities are independent of the mind and secondary qualities are dependent on the human mind as for example, different people will feel different temperatures of an object.

To eliminate scepticism about his theism, Berkeley gives some arguments which are as follows.

- Berkeley asserts that Ideas exist only in our minds and no external entities are like them.
- He says that we cannot frame coherent ideas of objects with primary qualities alone without using secondary qualities.
- Primary qualities such as distance, velocity, etc. are also relative. So Berkeley says that this also depends on the human mind.
- Berkeley says that matter as a substratum should support primary qualities. So there is no relation between matter and primary qualities. So primary qualities are totally independent of matter.
- Berkeley says that there is no need to assert that the material world exists as Locke also admitted that material things can be perceived indirectly using secondary qualities which are mind dependent.
- Berkeley says that suppose there is a material world then there is no way to describe how the material could generate ideas in the mind.

- Ideas are inert(lack of causal power). So if there were the existence of primary qualities independent of mind then they too would be inert.

Berkeley says that we can generate ideas on our own will. Therefore coherently we can postulate a more powerful mind of God which constitutes reality.

Berkeley's Theism - Discussion

In this section, the author briefly discusses arguments that Berkeley has made to prove his idealism and also about rival hypothesis materialism.

Argument:- Why theism as he could have gone for panpsychism.

The first thing that should be noted is instead of the single divine mind, we can have many minds, meaning we can go for panpsychism and can go for many interacting minds. Berkeley has no good answer for this objection.

Berkeley says that we find a degree of order in ideas of sense themselves. But it's incomplete as it doesn't represent an ordered system of things. So we can have two explanations to support this. First is God has already given ideas of objects which exist in reality. So we pick out an object from this collection. Second is that our mind is directly connected with the divine mind and in the divine mind, all archetypes of objects(collection of ideas) are present from which systematic reality is formed.

Argument:- None of the arguments of Berkeley to prove his theism is against materialism

Berkeley said that primary qualities are also subject to illusion as it is relative. But relateness doesn't imply that it is mind dependent. So the third argument is wrong. Another thing is secondary qualities like color, temperature, etc. use an object's location and extension in space as a starting point. For example, to measure the temperature of someone, first we have to locate him and then we can measure it. In this way, Primary qualities roughly resemble ideas about an object. So the first argument of Berkeley collapses. The primary qualities of Locke don't include space occupier property like density. But it includes the shape and dimensions of objects in space from which it supports space occupancy of matter. In this way, Berkeley's fourth argument was also rebutted. The sixth argument doesn't support anything from idealism, materialism and phenomenalism. So it's useless. The sixth argument about incomprehensibility of action of a material object to produce ideas is difficult for materialists. It doesn't support idealism. Now we can resemble ideas using primary qualities. Inertness of Ideas doesn't say that primary qualities must be inert.

Now the question is which one provides a better explanation of reality? In materialism, objects exist in three-dimensional space whether they are being perceived or not. By perceptual experiences or sensory inputs like we can see, hear, notice the smell of an object, we have an interpretation of that object. Nowadays, modern science is also tracing the sense organs and nerves which creates a system connected with the brain. This detailed explanation of sensory systems sets a problem for rival theism. For this, the theistic hypothesis gives two possible explanations. The first is that there is no truth in scientific details. God feeds the human mind such ideas. The second is that God's ideas are too systematic as the physical world according to materialists which means God himself is perceiving this euclidian world. The first argument is very implausible. Only one thing that can support that is some observation which doesn't follow consistent physics theory like light can act as a wave and a particle. Though this can be described using quantum physics. It is very hard to see that God feeds the human mind a fully perfect systematic world. The second one is more plausible though there are some objections. First is that Berkeley says that ideas of sense are put in the human mind by God then all sensory systems that one can see like eyes, retina connections with the brain and all that stuff are illusory. This makes the physical world very odd. Berkeley says that we can't understand the connection between mental state and sensory experience in the sixth argument which was a great difficulty for materialists but after the scientific revolution, it is a great problem for the theistic approach too. The second problem is that suppose I am moving my hand on my own will and changing the location of a book. So we are possibly changing God's idea about books. The third problem is that if all that we see and feel are God's ideas then they need not be consistent. For example, there is some space area in which there is nothing which means that God has no idea about what to make even not have an idea of emptiness. This objection doesn't imply that the material world exists. These two interpretations about reality still cope with each other. But due to science, the material hypothesis should be preferred.

4.II Key ideas and sentences

- Objects are just the collection of ideas and these objects can exist in our mind by being perceived. There is no material world which we sense according to Berkeley.
- The former ideas(Ideas of senses) in which we can find steadiness and coherence constitutes reality called laws of nature which exist there independent of human perceiver's will as it is perceived by God.

- Materialism has the same view of reality as what we perceive by our senses based on science.

4.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Ontological argument: arguments for the conclusion that God exists

Immaterialist philosophy: a kind of philosophy that assumes that there is no material existence.

Theism: Theory which says the physical world depends on God for existence.

Panpsychism: Panpsychism is the view that all things have a mind and Everything is conscious.

Materialism: Materialism is a form of philosophy that holds matter to be the fundamental substance in nature.

Solipsism: a theory says that the self can know nothing but its own modifications and that the self is the only existent thing.

Phenomenalism: It is the view that physical objects cannot exist by themselves, but only as perceptual phenomena situated in time and in space.

Idealism: type of view in which reality is not constituted by matter but by ideas.

4.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

Key arguments are mentioned in the summary.

5 Cosmological Arguments

5.I Summary

Cosmological arguments entail the theist must argue from the world to GOD. The cosmological arguments start from the very fact that there is a world or from such general features of it as change or motion or cautions and argue to GOD as uncaused cause of the world or those general features or as its creator or reason for its existence.

A. Contingency and Sufficient Reason

Argument

Things must have a sufficient reason for their existence, and this must be found ultimately in a necessary being. There must be something free from the disease of contingency, a disease which affects everything in the world and the world as a whole, even if it is infinite in time. Thus, God is that necessary being which contains its own sufficient reason outside the series of contingency.

Leibniz Argument

He assumes the principle of sufficient reason. Everything in the world has sufficient reason to exist. Each thing in the universe is contingent means depend on other things. The world is a collection of such things and so the world itself is contingent. And if we go back in time we still have the contingency so to break it there must be something outside this series that created the universe and this will have to be a necessary being that has its own sufficient reason for existence.

Criticism of Argument

1. How do we know that everything must have a sufficient reason?

The principle of sufficient reason is not a priori. Leibniz thought that it is implicit in our reasoning in both physics and human behavior. In Physics - Archimedes proposed that, in symmetrical balance, equal weights are placed, none will go down. Because there is no reason why one side goes down then another side. and equally a rational being cannot act without motive. He uses the principle of like causes producing the like effects.

In Human Behaviour - Samuel Clarke said that someone who has a good reason for doing either A or B, but no reason for doing one of these rather than other then will surely choose arbitrary rather than doing neither. So in concluding this principle is a posteriori, by the degree of success we have had in interpreting the world with their help. So, we can say have some ground for saying that the world as a whole has a sufficient reason of some different sort. This principle expresses the demand that things should be intelligible through and through. There is no satisfactory explanation for Sufficient reason so we can consider it theologically that sufficient reason is a demand for absolute purposiveness.

2. How can there be a necessary being, one that contains its own sufficient reason?

Kant's criticism of Leibniz argument

He claimed that, The cosmological proof depends upon the already criticized ontological one because it consists of a necessary being. The cosmological proof purports to show that there is something that is not

contingent and exists necessarily and contains its own sufficient reason. But the answer to the second question is a notion of an ens realissimum whose essence includes existence (starting point of Descartes ontological proof).

B. The Regress Of causes

Argument

If everything was able-not-to-be then in at some time there would have been nothing and then even now there would be nothing impossible. Then it cannot be true that everything is able not to be. So there must be something necessary. Everything necessary either has a cause of its necessity outside itself or it does not. But it is impossible to go back in time and find the cause outside itself. So we must assume there should be something necessary through itself, which does not have its cause of necessity outside itself, but it is the cause for other things which is GOD.

Things that are not able to be something like 'impermanent things'. But it would not have been possible for 'impermanent things to have lasted through an infinite time and they would have perished already. If each thing were impermanent, it would be the most improbable good luck if the overlapping sequence kept up through infinite time. Also even if this holds, we might regard a series of overlapping things as themselves things which had already lasted through infinite time, so could not be 'impermanent. Indeed if there were such a series that never failed, this might indicate that there was some permanent stock of material from which the perished things were composed and into which they disintegrated, thereby contributing to the composition of other things.

Thus, there is at least one thing that is necessary in the sense, which has now become clear, that is permanent, that for some reason it is not able to be.

First Cause Argument

Things must be caused, and their causes will be other things that must have causes, and so on. But this series of causes cannot go back indefinitely. It must terminate in a first cause, and this first cause will be God.

Criticisms Questions?

- Why must the regress terminate at all?
- Why, if it terminates, must it lead to single termination, to one first cause, rather than to several distinct uncaused causes?
- Even if this is one first cause then why should we consider it as GOD?

Aquinas Five ways

- The first way argues to a first mover, using the illustration of something's being moved by a stick only when the stick is moved by a hand; here the various movements are simultaneous. we do not have a regress of causes in time.
- The efficient causes are contemporary agents. It is not possible to go infinite in a series of efficient causes. because first causes intermediate and the intermediate causes last. But if there is no cause then no effect. So if one goes infinite in time then there would not be the first cause then no intermediate and no last.
- The third is in the two stages - The first stage, If everything was able-not-to-be then in at some time there would have been nothing and then even now there would be nothing impossible. Then it cannot be true that everything is able not to be. So there must be something necessary. In the second stage, Everything that is necessary either has a cause of its necessity outside itself or it does not. But it is impossible to go back in time and find the cause outside itself. So we must assume there should be something necessary through itself, which does not have its cause of necessity outside itself, but it is the cause for other things which is GOD.

Criticisms of Aquinas Five Stages

1). In the first stage 'what is not able to be, sometimes it is not?'

Perhaps Aquinas means for able not to be - impermanent things. But there would have been nothing that does not follow because might some impermanent things have been excited all past time and will get perish in future. Maimonides (Aquinas argument influenced by him) - It would not have been possible for impermanent things to have lasted for an infinite time, so they would have perished already. Another objection of this sort is that, there might be a series of things, each of which was impaired and perished after a finite period, but whose period of existence overlapped so that there was not a time when there was nothing. So it would be a clear logical fallacy that 'at some time everything is not'. Two ways to defend Aquinas, first, If each thing were impermanent, then it would be improbable good luck if they were overlapping over infinite time. second, if this luck holds, then there should be some permanent stock of material from which these perished things are composed.

2). Why should something which is able not to nevertheless happen to exist always?

3). What does not exist cannot begin to be except through something that is. What if the series of permanent things broke off, then it would have been never started after a gap.

Aquinas's first stage gives some degree of support that there is some permanent thing.

Al farabi Argument

Series of contingent beings which would produce one another cannot proceed to infinite or move in a circle.

In the second stage of acquaints, any permanent thing either depends for its permanence on something else or is per se necessarium in a sense that can apply to god. This entails that anything which is permanent but does not involve existence must, depend on something else. The Conclusion is that anything whose essence does not involve existence must, depend on another for its existence. SO the regress of line will end in a being whose essence includes existence whom all men call GOD. But we have no reason to accept this assumption because there might be a permanent thing that does not involve existence but did not derive its existence from something else.

C. Finite Past Time and creation

Argument

There cannot be an actual infinite - in particular an infinite past time. For example, if past time were infinite, an infinite stretch would have actually to have been traversed to reach the present, and this thought to be impossible. Thus, history of the world is finite.

Craig Argument

Craig argued that there is not infinite past time. If the past time were infinite then infinite stretch would have been traversed to reach the present and this is not possible.

Ghazali's argument in support of Craig

The planet Jupiter revolves in its orbit once in 12 years whereas Saturn once in 30 years. So, Jupiter must have completed more than 2 revolutions than Saturn. But in the case of infinite, it is the same which is a contradiction. We know by rational necessity that nothing which originates in time originates by itself, it needs a creator.

Cantor's paradox - An infinite class a part can indeed be equal to the whole.

Criticism Questions?

i) Does God's existence have a sheer origination in time? - sheer origination in the material world?

ii) Does god exist forever in infinite time? Again infinite. So we believe god's existence is not in a time at all but it is a mystery.

D. Swinburne's Inductive Cosmological Arguments

Argument

The hypothesis that there is GOD would to some extent explain the existence of the actual history of the Universe. There is quite a chance that if there is a GOD he will make something of the finitude and complexity of the universe. It is very unlikely that a Universe could exist uncaused, but rather more likely that GOD would exist uncaused. The existence of the universe is strange and puzzling. It can be made comprehensible if we suppose that it is brought about by GOD. This supposition postulates a simpler beginning of explanation than does the supposition of an uncaused universe, and that is grounds for believing the former supposition to be true. Thus, It is more likely that there should be an uncaused GOD who created the universe than a simple uncaused universe.

Swinburn argument

H hypothesis is confirmed

$$P(e/h\&k) > P(e/k) \text{ Or } P(e/h\&k) > P(e/ h\&k)$$

Example,

H = Fred walked along the path, E = footmarks, If with only H and E we cannot confirm the H, because suppose

BK = Fred's Twin brother sometimes borrow the Shoe and walked along that way then we can't confirm the H.

Or BK = If Fred died before the last heavy rain then also we cannot conform H.

Example,

H = there is a GOD

E = There should be such a universe.

However, Swinburne indeed does not say that hypothesis h there is a GOD makes it very probable that E. He Said that there is GOD does not imply that there is such a universe.

But $P(e/h\&k) > P(e/k)$. So there is a Good C-inductive argument from the existence of a complex physical universe to the existence of the god of traditional theism. Proving that a complex universe is uncaused is not likely than saying that the GOD's existence is uncaused. From all the background knowledge it is more likely that there should be an uncaused GOD who created the World than simply an uncaused universe.

Criticisms

No plausibility in the statement that it is rather more likely that GOD would exist uncaused.

Swinburn's answer is that is a very simple supposition. where there is a complexity, finitude, and particularity about the universe which cries out for the explanation.

5.II Key ideas and sentences

- God is that necessary being that contains its sufficient reason outside the series of contingency.
- Things must have a sufficient reason for their existence
- God is permanent
- The history of the world is finite
- It is more likely that there should be an uncaused GOD who created the universe than a simple uncaused universe

5.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Cosmological argument: an argument for the existence of God which claims that all things in nature depend on something else for their existence (i.e. are contingent) and that the whole cosmos must therefore itself depend on a being that exists independently or necessarily.

Contingent - dependant on

Ens realissimum - the most real being, something whose essence includes existence.

a priori - relating to or denoting reasoning or knowledge that proceeds from theoretical deduction rather than observation or experience. It is a theoretical deduction.

Reasoning - the act of thinking about something in a logical, sensible way.

A posteriori - is a term applied to knowledge considered to be true based on experience, observation, or existing data

Brute facts - a brute fact is a fact that has no explanation. More narrowly, brute facts may instead be defined as those facts which cannot be explained (as opposed to simply having no explanation).

Regress - The act of passing back; passage back; return; retrogression.

Envisage - To conceive or see something within one's mind; to imagine or envision.

Able not to be - dependant, contingent.

per se necessarium - to eternal life by any means necessary

Revelation - is the divine or supernatural disclosure to humans of something relating to human existence.

Sheer origination - Not determined by anything,

C's argument - the premises and evidence confirm the conclusion or hypothesis in the former sense. Hypothesis by evidence. Zero initial probability.

P's argument - the premises and evidence confirm the conclusion or hypothesis in the latter sense.

5.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

- See the Argument section in all the 5 subsections

6 Moral Arguments for the Existence of a God

6.I Summary

Popular line of thought:

Argument: Moral principles tell us what we must do, whether we like it or not i.e. they are like commands. These commands go beyond human authority and sometimes requires us to resist all human authority, thus they must be commands from something more than human, like God. Moreover, we tend to obey these commands thinking that there is a being who has the power to give both rewards and punishment outweighing all worldly losses and gain.

Thus morality needs a God both as a commander and as a powerful wielder of sanctions. Thus Morality supports theistic beliefs.

Problem: If theistic beliefs are given up, morality loses its force to make humans abide by some rules.

Newman's argument: Conscience as a creative principle of Religion

Newman gives 2 meaning for Conscience:

- Normal sense of what we must or must not do.
- Sense of duty : Newman relies on this meaning as it refers to something beyond self.

As per meaning one, someone who recognizes his conduct as immoral does not feel any fear, but the second meaning implies that there is One to whom we are responsible, before whom we are ashamed. Thus conscience therefore must be related to some supernatural and divine person.

Dilemma to this argument : Kant's autonomy of morality as discussed in next section Author suggested that popular moral argument is seldom an original ground for religious beliefs but Newman says that not the argument but the actual experience of conscience is the original ground for such belief.

Argument: Newman's argument rests on 3 premises:

- Conscience is legitimate or authoritative.
- It looks beyond the agent himself for further imperative and higher sanction.
- These sanction must stem from a higher, intelligent person.

Now The first premise contradicts the other two, because if we take conscience as face value it is overwhelmingly plausible that it comes from other people, ultimately forms traditions and institutions, and not some supernatural person. Understanding conscience we do look beyond yourself but we look at natural, human sources not god. Here we are accepting second and third premise but modifying the first, thus it's not easy to accept all three. Newman gave conscience an authority but not complete autonomy.

If Newman takes conscience, which ties its moral ideas to belief in god, as its face value then he can indeed assert all three premises, but then this argument will be valid for only those who accept his conclusion of god.

This argument is undermined by two better available rival explanation:

- Ethical objectivism or intuitionism.
- Natural, psychological account of origin of conscience.

Kant : God as presupposition of morality

In Critique of pure reason, Kant argues there is no sound speculative proof of God's existence while in Critique of practical reason, he argues that moral reasoning can provide solutions to metaphysical questions like God's existence, immortality of soul, freedom of will. These all can be presupposed in moral consciousness.

Kant stresses on the autonomy of morality i.e. what is morally right is so, is in itself. Each rational being prescribes moral command to himself and so doesn't need God to command him. So he gives different argument for God in moral universe :

Argument: Kant says that Virtue and happiness together constitute the highest good for a person, both of these are independent of one another and the distribution of happiness in proportion to morality constitutes the highest good for a possible world. Thus our moral effort alone can't ensure us happiness, Kant says that we should endeavour to promote the highest good, thus it must be possible. Since it is possible someone has achieved this highest good, whom we call God. It is also necessary to assume that individuals survive in a life after death; as being necessary to allow for an indefinite progress towards perfection

Issue with the argument : ‘we ought to seek the highest good’ , does not require that the full realization of the highest good should be possible and to claim that it ‘must therefore be possible’ is the doubt. And even if we postulate God then it would ensure not merely the possibility but the actuality of the highest good.

Further Kant says in ‘metaphysics of moral’ about god’s existence in line with Newman’s argument about conscience. This has the same weaknesses as Newman had.

Thus even if we follow Kant’s argument we need not postulate God nor can we infer his real existence.

Sidgwick: Duality of practical reason:

Argument: The theory of ‘the duality of practical reason’ has premisses as:

- What I have most reason to do is always what will best secure my own happiness in the long run.
- What I have most reason to do is always what morality requires.
- If there is no moral government of the universe, what will best secure my own happiness is not always what morality requires.

Conclusion: There must be such a government, either a god or something like a god because only then prudence and morality always coincide. First two premises says that prudence and morality will always coincide and so based on third premises there is a moral government of the universe like a god

But although Sidgwick accepted all three premises, he did not accept the conclusion. He preferred to admit that there is a fundamental and unresolved chaos in our practical reasoning. The fact that one can’t act rationally without assuming a certain proposition, does not appear to him a sufficient ground for believing it to be true.

Nothing has been done to explain how pure practical reason could escape the constraints which, as Kant admits, apply to practical reason in general. If a certain practical principle presupposes certain factual propositions, then reason, however pure, cannot establish the validity of that practical principle without independently showing that those factual propositions are true. We cannot therefore use the practical principle to prove that these are truths of fact

Sidgwick’s first two premises do not hold without qualification as principles of practical rationality. So we can say that there is no fully coherent ideal of practical reason .

God and the Objectivity of Value

Philosophers have criticized the suggestion that moral obligations are created by God’s commands. For any obligation that they introduce, there must be a more fundamental obligation, like the general obligation for us to obey him, that they presuppose. Thus His commands, therefore, cannot be the source of moral obligation in general but these fundamental obligations are.

Argument: Now in the objectivist view, moral values are held to supervene upon some natural features of situation or action. There must be something other than its rightness or wrongness that makes an action right or wrong. Swinburne says that ‘Once one has specified fully what it is that makes the action wrong, then it will be an analytic truth that an action of that kind is wrong. But this cannot be right. Objective wrongness, if there is such a thing, is intrinsically prescriptive or action-guiding. But the natural features on which the moral ones supervene cannot be intrinsically action-guiding or reason-giving in this way. Supervenience, then, must be a synthetic connection. Now, such and such relations of supervenience which would then be in principle something that a god might conceivably create; and since they would otherwise be a very odd sort of thing, the admitting of them would be an inductive ground for admitting also a god to create them. Thus we have, after all, a defensible inductive argument from morality to the existence of a god.

Why should not the objectivist say that certain natural features simply do in themselves constitute reasons for or against the actions that involve them? Why postulate a god, of all things, to explain this matter? The answer is that the more intrinsically puzzling something is, the more it requires, to explain it, something whose power is limited only by logical necessity.

Problem in argument: If we put it in terms of truths of supervenience, are these synthetic truths necessary or contingent? Do they hold in all possible worlds or only in some?. “However, this problem only brings into the open the intuitionist moral epistemology which is at least implicit in any coherent doctrine of objective prescriptivity.”

In consequence, although the objectivity of prescriptive moral values would give some inductive support to the hypothesis that there is a god, it would be more reasonable to reject the kind of moral objectivity that is required for this purpose than to accept it and use it as a ground for theism

6.II Key ideas and sentences

- Morality needs a God both as a commander and as a powerful wielder of sanctions.
- Not the popular moral argument but the actual experience of conscience is the original ground for religious belief.
- Autonomy of morality
- We should endeavour to promote the highest good, thus it must be possible.
- There is a fundamental and unresolved chaos in our practical reasoning. The fact that one can't act rationally without assuming a certain proposition, does not appear a sufficient ground for believing practical reasons to be true.
- For any obligation that God introduces, there must be a more fundamental obligation, like the general obligation for us to obey him, that they presuppose.
- Natural features on which the moral ones supervene cannot be intrinsically action-guiding or reason-giving in this way. Supervenience, then, must be a synthetic connection created by god.

6.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Highest Good / Summum bonum: highest virtue and highest happiness. It requires highest moral happiness as happiness is in harmony with morality.

'The duality of practical reason': the fact that both prudential egoism (caring for oneself only) and the commands of conscience are practically reasonable, and yet without god or anything like a god, they will not always coincide.

Intrinsically prescriptive / action-guiding: to say that the reasons that they give for doing or for not doing something are independent of that agent's desires or purposes

Ethical objectivism/intuitionism: some moral truths can be known without one needing to infer them from other truths one believes

Supervenience: X is said to supervene on Y if and only if some difference in Y is necessary for any difference in X to be possible.

Pure reason: knowledge that is acquired independently of any particular experience

Practical reason: use of reason to decide how to act

Speculative reason: use of reason to decide what to follow

Objectivity of Value: has value independent of any relationship to what people may want or believe

Objective prescriptivity: principles whose right/wrong-ness is independent of agent's will/desire.

6.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

See **Argument** paragraph in all the 5 subsections

7 The Arguments from Consciousness

7.I Summary

In this chapter, the main Problem is "How could Consciousness arise in a purely material universe?" Many philosophers like Cicero, Locke, Swinburne, Donald Davison have different arguments on this to define consciousness. so the chapter is roaming around these arguments of consciousness.

Cicero's Argument:

One can not memorize with memory in the head. He himself learns to memorize by heart.

Reason: there is not enough space in a man's head.

Solution: There must be some immortal rational thing that exists.

Locke gave an argument of the existence of GOD.

- An irrational thing can not produce rationality.
- matter can not produce so much motion.
- matter and motion can not produce thoughts itself.

Locke's argument

One who exists eternally must be rational.

Reason: nonentity cannot produce a real being.

Problem: What sort of thing must be 'that eternal'?

Answer a thesis that could not be formulated from an incognitive being would stay in the eternal mind. Locke's argument also becomes weaker by saying that God has given immaterial thinking to certain material bodies.

Swinburne's main task was to prove the scientific inexplicability of consciousness. -He argued that one can not deny sensory experience like the loudness of painfulness does not describe how things are showing on his face.

For a complete scientific explanation of mental events, he says materialists would need to take three distinct steps.

- find a correlation between mental and brain events.
- convert this correlation in causal events.
- find natural relation between mental and brain events.

Difficulties in these steps

- lack of observability
- freedom of choice
- Quantum physics

Donald Davidson gave an argument against the existence of psychological laws.

- mental descriptions are quite different from the physical descriptions. someone's beliefs or desires are should match with expectations, hopes, and fears.
- His question was are these psychological descriptions supposed to be true? Or is it just a person's behavior over some longish period of time.
- Another popular argument against psychophysical laws is that there cannot be biconditional relationships among mental and physical events, as for example if there are Martians, it is not necessary that it will meet with our imagination in our thought.

Swinburne said that the indeterminism of Quantum physics is helping in the second step as being a reason for choices or events which have no antecedent sufficient cause. In the third step, Swinburne finds difficulties in finding natural connections between the brain and mental events.

The main question is: Are there any scientific laws that define mind-body correlation? Even if we make such laws it is almost impossible to find initial relevant events. The only thing which is hard to explain by simple physical law is consciousness. This is making the main difference between Human beings and Computers.

Because of these difficulties, Swinburne examines two possibilities

- Dualism - mental thing and physical thing. both can not explain each other. scientific explanation hold for physical thing and personal explanation would be for the fulfillment of our intentions.
- Personal explanation - We can avoid all dualism of type of explanation by making all explanations personal. it depends on just fulfillment of God's intentions. He said that the existence of consciousness can be easily explained by the theistic hypothesis. How good is this argument?

This depends on the naturalness of connections between intentions and fulfillment. We form the picture of things which we want to do in our mind. The resulting movement mirrors the content of decisions or intentions. Swinburne replied that it is written in the theistic hypothesis that God can fulfill these intentions.

Difficulties in personal explanations:

- Has god brought consciousness to the material structure but then there is no more difficult to understand that material structure can do it by itself.
- Why does God give this consciousness to only some material structure why it does not exist in a block of wood?

The natural law of emergence for awareness is hard to understand by both extreme materialism and theism. That's why we are stuck in some dualism kind of thing.

7.II Key ideas and sentences

- Locke said that there is something eternal that exists that is cognitive.
- Swinburne demonstrates the Scientific inexplicability of Consciousness.
- Donald Davidson said that Bidirectional relationships are not necessary. It is possible that mental predicates do not meet physical predicates.
- As Quantum physics is indeterministic, If we don't find any reason for an event then we can think of quantum physics as an antecedent.
- Awareness is the main pillar that is making difference between us and computers no matter how intelligent computers are.
- Dualism idea said that mental events will not explain physical one and vice-versa.
- In Personal explanation, we are making all explanations ultimately theistic.

7.III Glossary of Important Concepts

dualism: two things exist and they don't depend on each other. the division of something conceptually into two opposed or contrasted aspects, or the state of being so divided.

personal explanation: belonging to or affecting a particular person rather than anyone else. One can make its own perception of the thing. for example, for consciousness, one can think of God as a reason irrespective of another person's point of view.

theism: belief in the existence of a god or gods, specifically of a creator who intervenes in the universe.

scientific explanation: a way of explaining something we see in the natural world that's based on observations and measurements

materialism: all views are dependent on the physical process

teleological: relating to or involving the explanation of phenomena in terms of the purpose they serve rather than of the cause by which they arise.

7.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

- Something that exists from eternity must be a 'cognitive being', an eternal mind, and then appeals to other sorts of evidence to support the ascription to this eternal mind of the traditional attribute of God.
- personal explanation one in terms of the intended action of an intelligent agent is more probable the latter hypothesis can account better for phenomena of consciousness, and therefore confirmed by their undeniable occurrence.

8 Arguments For Design

8.I Summary

Hume's Dialogues - Exposition:

This argument flourished in the 18th century, this was a time when natural science was attempting to reveal that design is a creative activity of God. This was overwhelmingly criticized by Hume in his "Dialogues concerning Natural Religion" and by Kant philosophically. This criticism was further bolstered In the 19th century by Darwin and Wallace when they founded the Theory of Evolution. This theory explained the design and structure of Plants and animals , their bodies and their adaptations of surroundings. This theory threw some light on

the unexplained hypothesis posted by natural science using suitable assumptions. This came as a setback for arguments for design.

Marks of design are those features in which natural objects resemble machines made by man. In the 18th century 3 kinds of features particularly impressed the thinkers (i) the world as a whole, (ii) the bodies of all sorts of plants and animals and (iii) providential arrangement of things on the surface of earth. Hume's Dialogues are called the masterpiece of philosophical literature. In these Hume pits 3 characters against each other Cleanthes, Demea and Philo. Cleanthes represents natural theology, he relies on design arguments and stresses that its a posteriori and probabilistic character. He concludes that there is a god who closely resembles the human mind. Demea on the other hand is a hardline theist, he engages in natural theory but he relies on a priori arguments, acknowledging certainty for the existence of god. His reliance lies on his faith. Philo takes a sceptical approach and takes a middle ground between Cleanthes and Demea. By this approach Hume tries to bring out contrasting and inconsistent strains in religious thought which are represented by Cleanthes and Demea. Hume's own view is represented by Philo, that is the criticism of the argument for design.

Hume's Dialogues - Discussion

Here the author discusses the various arguments that were put forward by Cleanthes, Demea and Philo(Hume) with respect to design arguments. One of the points of discussion being that the simplest approach would be to accept that god is responsible for the natural world. This is called a theistic hypothesis. This approach does not explain why we have these phenomena rather than any other. A scientific hypothesis is often confirmed by its success in explaining exactly what is observed and trying to explain the corner cases or the anomalies by making observations.

Evolution by natural selection mimics the purposiveness of what Cleanthes calls 'the curious adapting of means to ends, throughout all nature'. This is indeed the correct argument whereas the argument of special creation does not hold ground. The work of Darwin and his successors greatly diminish the logicity of the design argument.

The people who try to argue for the physico-theological argument, after making some logically acceptable arguments, fall back into the realm of mere possibilities. Kant makes a valid argument that the design argument has to fall back on the cosmological ones. He reiterates that the design argument cannot take the to the point where the theist wants it to go. Kant taking a lenient approach also goes on to say that design arguments could give us an architect god but we cannot classify god as a creator or a necessary being.

Swinburne's Restatement:

In this section Swinburne has tried to reanalyze and restate the design argument in a more convincing way. He tries to build upon two points to state the argument (i) spatial order and (ii) temporal order. Spatial order is about the existence of complex structures and builds upon Darwin's evolutionary theory. Nature is shown to be a machine making machine. This would imply that there would be a creator of the machine. But this is perceived as a weak reason as we can contradict that every organism is machine making machines that are capable of reproduction. Hence this argument does not find much support, as ultimately it falls back to the cosmological arguments. On the other hand the arguments based on temporal order are much stronger. These arguments answer two objections regarding regularity.

Swinburne says science may explain some regularities by deriving them from others but it cannot explain the highest-level laws. By staging this he is not trying to imply that temporal order could not have occurred without a designer, but he is trying to imply that for such regularities there is a probability that god exists.

The supposition that there simply is temporal order as an ultimatum is much more probable. But all these objections on spatial order and temporal order can be avoided by going back to the argument that god is self-explanatory, but this ultimately reverts back to the cosmological arguments whose weaknesses are already known.

We can conclude that arguments for design cannot be revived, the advancements of science have made them unsubstantiated.

8.II Key ideas and sentences

- The steps that lead from evidence that is often called as marks of design, to the conclusion is called as product of design.
- Ideas in our mind fall into order of themselves, without any known cause.
- The five points of natural order:

- Is the analogy between natural order and artefacts good enough to justify theism for explanation of natural order?
 - Even if the answer to the prior question is yes there are enough counter arguments to weaken the former.
 - Even after various arguments we are able to justify theism, the divine mind itself is in much need of explanation as the order in the world.
 - Even if all three arguments are overcome it is very difficult to justify the presence of evil as well as good at the same time.
 - Even if we are able to justify the theistic hypothesis for all the previous arguments it would still be useless as we could not use it to argue back to otherwise unknown features of the world or of our own life.
- A mental world or universe of ideas requires a cause as much as does a material world or universe of objects.

8.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Marks of design: These are those features in which natural objects resemble machines made by men.

Cosmological argument: It is an attempt to prove the existence of God by the fact that things exist. It assumes that things must have a cause, and that the chain of causes can only end by a supernatural event.

Spatial order: It is the existence of things with certain complex structures.

Temporal order: arrangement of events in time, in a chronological sequence.

8.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

- The temporal order of the world is where explanation stops, and the second is that the temporal order of the world is due to the agency of god.
- The steps that lead from evidence that is often called as marks of design, to the conclusion is called as product of design.
- Machine-making machines are peculiarly products of design.

9 The Problem of evil

9.I Summary

God is omnipotent and omniscient and wholly good, and yet there is an evil in the world, how can this be?

Good is apparently opposite to evil, so wholly good being eliminates evils as far as he can, and god is also omnipotent so he will eliminate evils completely. So evil shouldn't exist in the world. But evils do exist so there cannot be any such being. Problem of evil is a logical problem, it is theist's task to make it clearer and reconcile several beliefs that he holds, it is neither a scientific problem that can be solved by further discovery nor a practical problem that can be solved by decision or actions.

It can be said that this problem can be solved if we give up on at least one of the initial propositions, which leads to there is a sense of god who is not wholly good or omnipotent. Similarly one can argue that if we consider good is not sort of opposed to evil so this problem would not occur, but if one sticks to this argument then he must have to clearly explain the notion of good and evil for more common uses.

Possibility of solution lies in the modification of either or both additional premises: the opposition between good and evil is constructed in such way that wholly good god would not eliminate evils completely, though he can do so, and furthermore it can be argued that there are limits to what even an omnipotent being can do. This limit can be stated like, An Omnipotent being can not do something which is logically impossible to do, and this way it will not depart from the omnipotence. Good can not exist without evils, evils are necessary as a counterpart of good. This argument suggests that a wholly good and omnipotent god will not eliminate evils completely because it will result in the disappearance of the god as well. Counter argument of this can be: it is plausible to say, if some property is universal then there is no need to predicate it in any language, but it is not at all persuasive to say if no one lacked something then it would not exist, or if something is everywhere it ceases to be anywhere. so if a wholly good and omnipotent god will eliminate evils completely then it would result in the disappearance of the god as well.

Evils are necessary for the existence of good, it is similar to the argument that children can develop into a self-growing environment by being allowed to make mistakes and to learn from them. Any person may be ready

to put up with painful medical treatment if he is convinced that this is necessary for better lasting health. Pain also sometimes saves us from great injury or death. These are the examples in which relation between evils and goods can be seen. This explains why the greatest being whose power is only limited by the casual laws reasonably put up with the evils just for the sake of associated good. On the other hand, one can argue that god is omnipotent, that means he is all powerful, so must be beyond the such casual laws, and if consider any casual laws he must have created them, and due to his omnipotence he must be able to override them, so if there is a god then he does not need obey any rules for his own existence.

Above argument suggests that evils contribute to the goodness to make the world more beautiful and perfect than it could be if there were no evils. It is also a more kind of thing that contrasts heightened beauty. Kant also called it as an endless progress towards perfection: the gradual overcoming of evils by goods is a much finer thing than the eternal sovereignty of good. Pain, suffering, diseases are the physical evils which makes possible the existence of sympathy, kindness, heroism, etc. These are also called first-order evils, contrast of these are happiness, pleasure, examples of the first-order good. Distinct from this are the second-order goods, which emerge in organic whole with some first-order evils. First-order evils are logically necessary for the second-order good to emerge, how it emerges will vary from case to case. For example heighting of the happiness by the misery, sympathy with suffering, danger in heroism, etc. This second-order holds more magnitude than first-order evils. These argument solves problem by pointing out that, why there are evils and wholly good and omnipotent will not eliminate them completely, even if he can do so whatever logically possible and here he is limited by only one logical impossibility, that is, second-order good will not exists without first-order evils.

There are some second-order evils like malevolence, callousness, cowardice, cruelty, etc, and these are not incorporated with the second-order evils. These evils are the result of the bad choices made by humans or any other living beings. So now the question arrives: why would a wholly good and omnipotent god give humans free will which they have misused? The answer must be either this free will is a logically necessary component for the higher(third) order good or this is the higher(third) order good which outweighs the risks associated with itself. This is a reasonable argument why God has created such beings and left them as free.

The paradox of omnipotence:

Can an omnipotent God create something that he can not control?

If answer of this question is no then there is something that god can not create, which raise the question on his omnipotence and if the answer is yes then god create something but he can not control that thing, this again raise the question on his omnipotence, so either way we can say that god is not omnipotent. But one can argue that omnipotent means all powerful and he can do everything but he can not do something which is logically impossible, like an omnipotent being can not create square circle, because by definition square can not be circle and circle can not be square, this is logically impossible thing. Similarly, by definition God is omnipotent means he can do anything, and the question we are asking is: can God create something that he can not control?, a logical contradiction of the definition of the omnipotent.

The Free will defence:

Is God supposed to know in advance, when he created the men with free will, all the uses they will actually make of it? Let us first assume that he does know, we shall come back later when he doesn't. One can argue that it is better on the whole that men should act freely than they should be innocent automata acting rightly in a wholly determined way. If God had made men such that sometimes they choose good and sometimes evil, why wouldn't he make them such that they always choose good? Theists argue this by saying, if god had made men such that they always choose good, then god is forcing them to the only one choice and blocking the possibility of the other choices, which will not be free will for humans anymore. It may be argued that this notion of beings always freely choosing good assumes that humans are free from any sort of temptation, and always incline towards the good, which is in reality not true. Most humans have a mixture of good and bad inclinations. In the continuation of this, some said, god could have picked, either a humans with only good inclinations, that is what kant called holly will, or humans with mixture of good and bad inclinations, but always control their bad inclinations, that is what kant called sense of duty.

Now we have a question whether it might have been logically impossible for God to create human beings such that they always freely choose good.

Let us first assume it is possible that one man on one occasion should choose good, but this is not possible for all humans to do so. One can argue that what is freely done sometimes must be not done, freely chooseble always includes different alternatives. Author argued that there isn't any need, in this case, to include variation, because it will raise the question of free will being third-order good. Whatever the value of variation of free will is, it always exists without the bad choice. This is possible, might it not be logical that God should create them

so. God is omnipotent and omniscient, he knows nature of all humans before he created them, so if he knows nature, he knows exactly how one will behave and make a choice, so in this way no humans have free will.

Leibniz argued that if God wanted then he had created the perfect world, which can be the best of all possible worlds, and also has maintained his own existence in it, with only good people and without any evils. But Plantinga argued that there are possible worlds which even an omnipotent being can not create. He explained this by story, let say there is Curly Smith fictional mayor of boston, he is in the situation in which he offered the bribe, If he takes it then god is not able to create world in which he rejects it, and if he rejects it then god is not able to create world in which he takes it, in either case there is one world that god can not create. Furthermore, Plantinga explained that, in any case, Curly makes at least one wrong choice if he is completely free. Plantinga called it transworld depravity. So, one thing is clear: God should not create man like Curly, but what if all creatures God has created are suffering from transworld depravity. This is only possible if God had a limited range of possibilities from which he had to choose.

9.II Key ideas and sentences

- Evils are necessary for the existence of the God, without them the God himself might not be considered.
- God can only do logically possible things.
- God will not eliminate evils completely even though he is omnipotent and wholly good.
- Author said that God could have created the world in which humans always freely choose good.
- Humans will be ready to do evil things if they are convinced that the outcome will be much higher order good.
- God can see the all possible choices that any humans can make, but the humans are free to choose anything among the possibilities.

9.III Glossary of Important Concepts

theism: belief in the existence of a god or gods, specifically of a creator who intervenes in the universe.

doctrine: a belief or set of beliefs held and taught by a Church, political party, or other group

omnipotent: having infinite power, omniscient - knowing everything, these two words used to describe characteristics of the god

aesthetic: Aesthetics, or esthetics, is a branch of philosophy that deals with the nature of beauty and taste, as well as the philosophy of art.

malevolent: having or showing a wish to do evil to others.

callousness: insensitive and cruel disregard for others.

rectitude: morally correct behaviour or thinking

benevolence: the quality of being well meaning, kindness

omnificence: having unlimited power of creation

9.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

- God is omnipotent and omniscient and wholly good, and yet there is an evil in the world, how can this be?
- Can an omnipotent God create something that he can not control?

10 Religious Experience and Natural Histories of Religion

10.I Summary

A. The Varieties of Religious Experience

Through Kant's influence, the traditional 'proofs' of theistic doctrines have been widely rejected or abandoned-though, among Christian thinkers. A widespread response to these difficulties has been a shift of emphasis away from proofs and even from doctrines of a metaphysical sort, and a growing reliance instead upon religious experience.

This reliance can take either of two very different forms

1. it may be held that religious experience itself is all that matters.
2. Something further may be taken to be the central doctrines of traditional theism.

Any experience must have an object, it must be something like The pain, or the dream. to have some understanding of what sorts of experiences these are. For this, we need to look at William James's classical work, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*.

James's interest is particularly focused on the experiences, especially the solitary experiences of individual men and women. He assumes-though this, as we shall see, is controversial that all organized, institutional, religion, and all theology, are secondary outgrowths from these solitary experiences. Many religious experiences closely resemble, even in their sequences of contrasting phases, the almost universal human experience of being in love.

From a psychological point of view, as James himself makes clear, the phenomena of conversion, mind-cure, sensory or motor automatisms, inspiration, mysticism, and so on lend themselves very readily to being understood in terms of the operation of unconscious or subconscious parts of the mind.

We distinguished three different forms that such supernatural conclusions might take: the central theistic doctrines, the special teachings of a particular faith, and the existence merely of some higher but potentially friendly power. Religious experience is also essentially incapable of supporting any argument for the traditional central doctrines of theism. Nothing in an experience as such could reveal omnipotence, or perfect goodness, or eternity, or even that there is just one god. On this James says: 'I feel bound to say that religious experience, as we have studied it, cannot be cited as unequivocally supporting the infinitist belief.

James writes a common core of intellectual content underlying all the discrepancies of the varied and conflicting creeds, namely the combination of an 'uneasiness' and a 'solution'. The uneasiness is that 'there is something wrong about us as we naturally stand'; the solution is that we are saved from the wrongness by making the proper connection with the higher powers. However, So far... as this analysis goes, the experiences are only psychological phenomena. The issue is whether the hypothesis that there objectively is something more gives a better explanation of the whole range of phenomena than can be given without it.

He says 'the theologian's contention that the religious man is moved by an external power is vindicated, for it is one of the peculiarities of invasions from the subconscious region to take on objective appearances and to suggest to the Subject an external control. In religious life, the control is felt as "higher".he rightly says, no authority emanates from mystical experiences because they can be so easily explained in purely natural, psychological, terms-for anyone who stands outside them to accept their revelations.

We can take the religious experience as sufficient in itself, without attempting to base on it an argument for any further, supernatural, reality. however, there are several more specific questions.

1. What value is found in these experiences by those who take them as what they purport to be, revelations of a deeper, supernatural, realm?

- Undoubtedly those who have these experiences and take them seriously find immense value in them. Yet even they will sometimes allow that this value is conditional upon their further fruits.

2. What value should we assign to these experiences, if we abandon any truth claims that they involve, but still consider the experiences as they are, containing those truth claims?

- Once we give up the assumption that the content of religious experience is true, we cannot reach any unequivocal estimate of their worth: whether their fruits are good or evil depends very much on other, surrounding factors.

3. Are these experiences more valuable as they are than otherwise similar ones that lacked those truth-claims would be?

- If the religious experiences do not yield any argument for a further supernatural reality, and if, there is no other good argument for such a conclusion, then these experiences include in their content beliefs that are probably false and in any case unjustified. This, it seems, must be scored as a disvalue against them. However, this judgment must remain provisional until we have considered, whether belief without reason, without intellectual justification, can nevertheless be defended.

4. Would they remain valuable if they had still the very same religious content, the same intentional objects, but those who had them no longer believed this content to be objectively true?

- Systematically to withdraw the claim to objective truth would in time significantly alter the internal quality of the experiences, and reduce, though not necessarily cancel their influence. But this question anticipates our consideration of the possibility of religion without belief.

B. Natural Histories of Religion

Every single experience is affected by a residue from earlier religious experiences; but it leaves not merely open but far more likely the alternative possibility that religion has sources other than any such experiences, that experiences in the sense in which James has surveyed them interact with other currents of thought and feeling to generate religion as a whole.

James's view that although 'on the hither side' the supposed objects of these experiences can be understood as belonging to the subconscious continuation of our conscious life, we need to postulate thing on the farther side' as well, that the natural psychological mechanisms may be a route by which we have access to another unseen supernatural reality, and that 'If there were such a thing as inspiration from a higher realm, it might well be that the neurotic temperament would furnish the chief condition of the requisite receptivity.

Hume entitled his work on this topic *The Natural History of Religion*, implying that he would describe religion as a natural phenomenon. he argues, The first religion was, he says, polytheism or idolatry. but he also argues a priori that theism could not have been the primary religion of the human race because the sort of reasoning that would lead to it does not come naturally to most people. Hume argues that its success is due not to the cogent reasoning in the design argument, but a curious development from polytheism. Hume thinks that it is rationally much less defensible than monotheism, but in some ways better adapted to the emotional needs of mankind. Hume's main purpose in this work is to drive a wedge between the religions that flourish and secure people's allegiance whether polytheist or monotheist. He wants to show that philosophy cannot be used to defend any ordinary popular religion.

It is surely beyond question that these are real tendencies in human thinking, and that they have contributed, along with the religious or mystical experiences of individuals, to the religious tradition. Later anthropologists inserted animism and magical belief as a stage preceding the worship of departmental deities. Tylor and Frazer saw magic as essentially a kind of pseudo-science and pseudo-technology, the imagining of causal relationships in many places where there are none and the attempt to use these imagined causal connections to bring about desired results. Tylor and Frazer saw [the rituals] as supplementations to the purposive activities.

The real mistake made by these anthropologists was to suggest that magic functioned only as pseudo-science and pseudo-technology. No doubt the rituals had genuinely beneficial, if not explicitly intended effects in sustaining morale and co-operation. Phillips is quite wrong in saying that 'When rituals are seen as expressions of this kind, it can also be seen that in no sense are they based on hypotheses or opinions'.

Ludwig Feuerbach argues that what was thus obviously true of earlier religions remains true of the most sophisticated. Anthropomorphism is not Feuerbach thinks, a fault, for its complete avoidance, would be a denial of religion. Any adequate social explanation of religion must take account of social division and conflict as well as cooperation. This view has several different facets. Most directly, it means that those who are deprived and exploited find or are given, an illusory consolation in religion. it means that the system of religious thought is part of an ideology through which the ruling class sees its position and procedures as justified, and, in so far as this ideology is transmitted to the lower classes, they too are encouraged to accept the existing order as right and proper and to see any revolt against it as being also a rebellion against God. More generally still, it means that religion is an expression of an alienated human nature, of a situation where men are cut off both from one another and from the economic resources and forces which they have brought into existence, and can be expected to disappear when such alienation ceases. There are elements of truth in this view, and it too is a contribution to the natural history of religion. But it also contains wild exaggerations. that religion expresses arise not only from economic deprivation and political oppression but also from psychological tensions with various other causes.

Another influential natural history of religion is that proposed by Freud and other psychoanalysts. The central theme in psychoanalysis is that a great many phenomena-dreams, neuroses, psychoses, mistakes, and slips, but also large parts of culture, including religion can be understood in terms of the fulfillment of unconscious and often repressed wishes. Freud saw an analogy between religious rituals and the elaborate and repeated performances of obsessional neurotics. He saw religion as one expression among others of the Oedipus complex. religious ideas are 'illusions, fulfilments of the oldest, strongest, and most urgent wishes of mankind.

Two main conclusions emerge from this survey of some proposed natural histories of religion.

- It would be a mistake to think that any one of them, by itself, can fully account for religion; but it is very likely that each of them correctly identifies factors that have contributed to some extent to religion, whether to the content of its beliefs, or to its emotional power, or to its practices and organization, both as originating and as sustaining causes.
- Even an adequate, unified, natural history that incorporated all these factors would not in itself amount to a disproof of theism.

Hume assume that pure theism, and only pure theism, was true; he aimed to separate popular, living, religion from this defensible philosophical view of the world. Feuerbach, Marx, and Freud all assumed that the explicit

doctrines of religion, taken literally, were false; but they also assumed that this falsity had been established already before they offered their accounts of the origin of religion. D. Z. Phillips's critical of Feuerbach, Durkheim, and Freud. resources for these experiences, since they can be fully explained on purely natural grounds, by reference to otherwise familiar psychological processes and forces. popular defenders of religion so often argue that man has a natural, psychological, need for religious belief.

They all presuppose that what is essential to religion and is therefore in need of explanation, is belief in an objective supernatural reality. Phillips is ready to concede, as his opponents hold, that such beliefs would be either false or meaningless, or at least ungrounded: this, he admits, has been established by Hume and his successors, provided that the religious statements are interpreted, as Hume and his successors have assumed, as making literal, factual, claims. But Phillips, following Wittgenstein, thinks that religion need not and should not be thus understood. If he is right, then our natural histories do, indeed, miss the mark.

10.II Key ideas and sentences

- The experiences would be essentially unchanged even if the associated doctrines were different, and whether those doctrines are true or false the experiences remain valid in their own right. second alternative. Something further may be taken to be the central doctrines of traditional theism.
- Any experience must have an object, it must be of something like The pain, or the dream.
- Religious experience is also essentially incapable of supporting any argument for the traditional central doctrines of theism.
- James rightly says, no authority emanates from mystical experiences because they can be so easily explained in purely natural, psychological, terms-for anyone who stands outside them to accept their revelations.
- The first ideas of religion arose not from a contemplation of the works of nature, but... from the incessant hopes and fears, which actuate the human mind.
- Religion expresses arise not only from economic deprivation and political oppression but also from psychological tensions with various other causes.

10.III Glossary of Important Concepts

doctrines - a belief or set of beliefs held and taught by a Church, political party, or another group.

spatio-temporal - belonging to both space and time or to space-time.

Mystics - a person who tries to gain religious or spiritual knowledge through prayer and deep thought

Hysteria - Hysteria is a term used to describe emotional excess, but it was also once a common medical diagnosis

mania - a psychological condition that causes a person to experience unreasonable euphoria, very intense moods, hyperactivity, and delusions

Automatism - a set of brief unconscious behaviors. These typically last for several seconds to minutes or sometimes longer, a time during which the subject is unaware of his/her actions.

Mysticism - belief that union with or absorption into the Deity or the absolute, or the spiritual apprehension of knowledge inaccessible to the intellect, may be attained through contemplation and self-surrender.

central theistic doctrines - Classical theism is a form of theism in which God is characterized as the absolutely ... principle of divine immanence as a central doctrine of classical theism

persecuted - subject (someone) to hostility and ill-treatment, especially because of their race or political or religious beliefs.

martyrdom - the death or suffering of a martyr.

Infinitist - a family of views in epistemology about the structure of knowledge and epistemic justification

mystical experience - a state of being in which the personal ego (or mortal sense of self) merges with the Divine

buoyant - able or tending to keep afloat or rise to the top of a liquid or gas.

Asceticism - severe self-discipline and avoidance of all forms of indulgence, typically for religious reasons.

fanaticism - the quality of being fanatical

anthropologists - the scientific study of humanity, concerned with human behavior, human biology, cultures, societies, and linguistics,

monotheism - the doctrine or belief that there is only one God.

Playsome whimsies - You will scarcely be persuaded, that they are anything but sick men's dreams: Or perhaps will regard them more

embroideries - the craft of decorating fabric or other materials using a needle to apply thread or yarn. Embroidery may also incorporate other materials such as pearls, beads, quills, and sequins.

Jehovah - the proper name of the God of Israel in the Hebrew Bible and is considered one of the seven names of God in Judaism.

Animism - the attribution of a living soul to plants, inanimate objects, and natural phenomena.

Anthropomorphisms - the attribution of human characteristics or behavior to a god, animal, or object.

ens realissimum - A term for God, reflecting the belief that reality, like goodness, comes in degrees, and that there must be a limiting, ultimately the real entity

epiphenomenon - a secondary symptom, occurring simultaneously with a disease or condition but not directly related to it.

Political economy - the study of production and trade and their relations with law, custom, and government; and with the distribution of national income and wealth.

proletariat - the social class of wage-earners, those members of a society whose only possession of significant economic value is their labor-power.

10.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

- Religious experience cannot be cited as unequivocally supporting the infinitist belief.
- James solitary to return to a sort of polytheism', which, he remarks, 'has always been the real religion of common people.'
- Hume argues, The first religion was, he says, polytheism or idolatry.
- Hume wants to show that philosophy cannot be used to defend any ordinary popular religion.
- The ritual is not performed to express anything; it is the expression of something.
- Religious ideas are 'illusions, fulfilments of the oldest, strongest, and most urgent wishes of mankind.
- Hume assume that pure theism, and only pure theism, was true; he aimed to separate popular, living, religion from this defensible philosophical view of the world.
- Phillips, following Wittgenstein, thinks that religion need not and should not be thus understood. If he is right, then our natural histories do, indeed, miss the mark.

11 Belief without Reason

11.I Summary

From our discussion the author said that the central doctrines of theism cannot be rationally defended. Even those who have believed in theism cannot justify their beliefs.

Many adherents from many religions just accept faiths, therefore no need for rational support for central doctrines of those religions. By the natural history of religion we can say not only belief can flourish without any rational support but also in opposition of evidence. So belief without reason is possible.

Pascal's Wager

In this argument pascal is not going to prove the existence of god. But Pascal shows some good reasons to believe in god.

Pascal says it is unable to decide whether god exists or not so he decided to play a game of chance to decide that. So Pascal says, If you bet on God's existence, then, if it turns out that he does exist, you gain infinite happiness; while, if it turns out that he does not exist, you lose nothing. But if you bet on God not existing, then, if it turns out that he does exist, you will have lost your chance of everlasting happiness; while, if it turns out that he does not exist, you gain nothing. So by this we clearly see that believing in god is the best decision. If you bet on God's existence, and if you lose, then it is not true that you lose nothing in betting on God's existence. you lose the worldly happiness that you could gain in this life if you were free from religious commitments.

An objection is that Pascal's wager is, There are many religions, and believing in the God of one religion might prevent gaining the infinite rewards of another religion. So, Pascal's wager doesn't give us a reason to pick one religion over another.

Second objection to pascal's wager is we have learned about concept of god and if we have no real evidence to convince yourself to believe in god then how could you possibly force yourself or someone to believe in god because it's a better gamble, it seems strange and we can't do that and if you are pretending to believe in god and if God is omniscient then God knows that you are faking him to earn your selfish reason so it would not turn in reward. So, when we take all such possibilities into account then Pascal's argument from comparative expectation falls to ground.

William James and the will to believe

William James given intellectually and morally superior argument then pascal.

In response to william clifford's argument William james said that there are situations where we can believe on insufficient evidence. James said we have Genuine options to believe any hypothesis. As James says, there are 3 characteristics of Genuine options.

- Living: A living option is one where the agent sees both the alternatives as serious possibilities.
- Momentous: one is one that matters, and in particular one where the agent has a unique opportunity, where his decision is not easily reversible, and if he lets this chance go it will not recur
- Forced: where the choice is between two exclusive and exhaustive alternatives

Our passionate nature not only law- fully may, but must, decide an option between propositions, whenever it is a genuine option that cannot by its nature be decided on intellectual grounds.

In this quote James is saying that when we don't have intellectual grounds to decide genuine options then our passionate nature is not only permitted to help us make that decision. We can't really believe anything based upon our emotion first that hypothesis has to pass the Genuine options test. James claims that having religious belief or not is a genuine option and one that cannot be decided on intellectual grounds therefore we could use our passionate nature to choose between hypotheses.

Clifford's fear of being wrong gave direction to his efforts to avoid error but James in contrast says, such a person is likely to miss out on great and wonderful truths. Also James said that the skeptic like Clifford reasons that it is better to risk a loss of truth than risk making an error, and he added this only appears neutral. The difference between James and Clifford is their Goals. Clifford's goal is to avoid errors at any cost. And James Goal is to aspire to great truths.

Now when it comes to religion there are 2 claims of James:-

- The best things are the more eternal things.
- We are better off even now if we believe 1st affirmation to be true.

In the first claim he is trying to say that belief in god seems a much more significant kind of choice and in the second claim he says that we are better off if we believe in religious things. In a rule of thinking James talks about these arguments. James encouraged people to have faith in religious matters so that they might excel. In a rule of thinking James talks about these logical arguments. James excuses religious controversy as a distraction. James has not included religious controversy because unity between different faiths is vague. He explained that religious freedom can only cover cases of action.

11.II Key ideas and sentences

- Our most holy religion is founded on faith, not on reason.
- Either God exists or he does not but, Pascal says, is unable to decide the question either way. So you are forced to play a game of chance: you must, in effect, bet on one or the other.
- It is wrong always, everywhere, and for everyone, to believe anything upon insufficient evidence.
- Our passionate nature not only law- fully may, but must, decide an option between propositions, whenever it is a genuine option that cannot by its nature be decided on intellectual grounds
- It is only our already dead hypotheses that our willing nature is unable to bring to life again. But what has made them dead for us is for the most part a previous action of our willing nature.
- First, she says that the best things are the more eternal things, the overlapping things, the things in the universe that throw the last stone, so to speak, and say the final word... The second affirmation of religion is that we are better off even now if we believe her first affirmation to be true.

- a rule of thinking which would absolutely prevent me from acknowledging certain kinds of truth if those kinds of truth were really there, would be an irrational rule

11.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Passional nature: In this text passional nature means our emotions

Intellectual grounds: this states our logical ability

Absolutism: The acceptance of or belief in absolute principles in philosophical matters

Dogmatism: the tendency to lay down principles as incontrovertibly true

Empiricism: the theory that all knowledge is derived from sense-experience.

Agnosticism: Agnosticism is the view that the existence of God or the supernatural is not known with any certainty.

12 Religion without Belief?

12.I Summary

Through this chapter, the author wants to ask whether one can understand the “religious belief” or perhaps defend it without including factual beliefs about the typically central religious doctrines. Many philosophers like Wittgenstein, Kierkegaard and DZ Phillips have their say on this.

Wittgenstein says that a religious believer’s belief could go against best scientific evidence even when a religious believer acknowledges that, that is indeed the best scientific evidence. Wittgenstein argues that any religion that is treated as being on the same plane as science, becomes superstition. He says that the firmness of belief is measured by the risks that the believers will take in reliance on it. The religious believer is taking something as a guidance for his whole life. Wittgenstein says that it is not so wise to compare religious belief and scientific belief.

There are many religious statements whose meaning can differ according to the person being theist or atheist. There are some statements which the believer is connected emotionally with, that he means these statements literally. Now, according to Wittgenstein and Phillips, this is described as superstition.

Phillips develops the views on God by comparing and contrasting magical belief and religious belief with metaphysical views.

There are two types of reductionist: conscious reductionist and unconscious reductionist. The conscious reductionist is Humean sceptic who holds that religion is a fiction, whose genesis we can explain, and which can then eliminate and do without. The unconscious reductionist aims rather at giving an account of religion belief not at eliminating it

Philips: never considers that religious belief is itself the expression of a moral vision. If God is not any human agency, it must be either oneself or some supernatural being. If Philips means that the content of the conviction is literally true, then he must defend the literal, objective, existence of God or something like God.

Either the believer claims literal truth for the religious statements and stories at least for some of them or he does not. If he claims it, Phillips says he is falling into superstition, and if he does not, then, like Braithwaite, he has reduced religion to something which lacks some of the fundamental characteristics of religious belief.

Many religious statements can be taken as expressing moral views and sentiments and resolve, and what, by Braithwaite’s account, they support is a way of life which makes sense in its own right.

To the talk of ‘God’, Phillips claims, is not to refer to an individual, an object. Then what is it? Here, Rhee’s dictum, ‘It is a confession or expression of faith’ is of little help. Even if we understand faith as being primarily trust and reliance rather than factual belief it still needs an object, that is, one can not rely without relying on something.

Philips speaks of a ‘sense of the given’: the believer sees new days, talents, opportunities and so on as gifts of God. He also says the praising and glorifying does not refer to some object called God. Rather, the expression of praise and glory is what we call worship of God. Praise logically requires only an intentional object. One cannot praise without praising something.

Philips considers the charge that his conclusions are simply a form of disguised atheism. There was an object corresponding to some religious pictures or perspectives, it could not be the God of religion, anything whose existence could be verified cannot be God.

12.II Key ideas and sentences

- Wittgenstein - “The firmness of the belief is not like the intensity of the pain; it can be measured by the risk that the believer will take in reliance on it, or by the extent to which the belief enters into the believer’s choice of action.”

- Braithwaite - “the stories, the religious statements, represent and support moral sentiments and resolve, but they are metaphorically true.”
- Philips - “If one is known continuously for what one is, one must be so known by someone or something. If it not any human agency then it must be oneself or some supernatural being ”

12.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Magical belief - a belief that one’s ideas, thoughts, actions, words, or use of symbols can influence the course of events in the material world.

Reductionist - a person who analyses and describes a complex phenomenon in terms of its simple or fundamental constituents.

13 Replacements for God

13.I Summary

Hume’s skeptic Philo wanted to give up the view of God as a person. According to him, the Whole of natural theology resolves itself into one simple and undefined proposition.

Plato’s thinking about god is it is an objective entity or principle of the universe and responsible for the existence of everything. according to him objects’ existence and beginning also come from god. E.g God is like the sun which not only provides light but also the creative energy which brings plants and animals to life.

John Leslie gave one metaphysical theory named “**extreme axiarchism**”.

Extreme axiarchism plainly presupposes and requires the objectivity of value. It also interprets this value or goodness as ethical requiredness. To say that something is good is to say that it is ethically required that it should be as it is. But also this theory proposes that this ethical feature requires existence. This theory’s greatest strength is this notion “that the ethical need for something could on its own call and creates its existence without the need of any person or mind that was aware of this need and acted so as to fulfill it.”

Leslie does not claim that there is any analytics connection between ethical requirements and creative requirements. He agrees that these are two distinguishable features. He suggested that there may be a synthetic but necessary(not a priori) connection between them. He makes no claim in priori certainty that ethical requiredness is creatively effective.

Leslie commonly speaks of creative effectiveness. E.g a deity would be a creator was a thing a necessary accompaniment of his wish for it, a wish which might be eternal. Similarly. That an ethical requirement ‘created’ the universe says that if there was no such requirement then the universes would not have existed even if the universe has existed always.

Leslie sums up his variant of the cosmological argument. The choice then seems between i) the universe or some part beating creative responsibility for the rest just happens to be there and ii) the universe existing thanks to its ethical requiredness.

Extreme axiarchism also faces its own variant of the problem of evil. according to Leslie “if goodness, ethical requiredness is the sole creative principle and the only explanation why there is any world at all we can ask when it is evil? ”. The dilemma is it is less satisfactory because less simple that value is even in principle, that there is an element of the sheer unexplained brute fact of things just happening to be there. This rejects the alternative hypothesis that ethical requiredness is creative. Leslie’s answer to the problem of evil is there may well be no unabsorbed evils when we take account of the value of lives that involve real choices a background of discoverable causal regularities, whether those choices are causally determined or not, for Leslie allows for a compatibilist view of freedom.

These were the arguments to show that extreme axiarchism is an acute rival to traditional theism which treats god as a person or mind or spirit. There is a place for a personal god. One is there might be such a god as one component among other of a universe whose ultimate source and explanation is its ethical requiredness. But Leslie remarks that it looks untidy and inessential to Christianity which worships goodness and not sheer power - not even when it conceives God as a person. There is even less reason for allowing the hypothesized principle of creative value to be called god. That would be a device for slurring over a real change in belief and in all likelihood an excuse for moving back and forth between theism and this alternative. Far from being honest to god, this is dishonest to both theism and extreme axiarchism. The latter should be seen and considered as what it is a radically different alternative and rival to theism. The availability of extreme axiarchism should tell against traditional theism with anyone who is dissatisfied for whatever reason with the naturalistic, skeptical, view of the world.

The problem of indifference(evil)

There are two aspects in the problem of indifference 1st is creative ethical requiredness like Leibniz's argument about god.

Leibniz's argument

He was against the Newtonian absolute space because he thought that if it would god would have been faced with the choice of creating the universe just where it is or creating it somewhere else.

The other aspect of the problem of indifference is There seem to be vast tracts of space-time and material existents that have no value worth mentioning. This was an important problem for Leslie cause he believed that only experiences, conscious states, could have intrinsic value.

13.I.1 Difficulty in Extreme axiarchism:

The difficulty is in its own central principle, the hypothesis that objective ethical requiredness is creative, that if something is valuable then it will be in existence by own or will maintain it and so they provide an ultimate explanation of its being there independent of everything. This principle is equivalent to the doctrine of intrinsic immanent teleology.

Extreme axiarchism rests essentially upon the assumption that there are objectively prescriptive values. which is a false assumption. The writer tells that as we cannot come to the conclusion of some ethical questions about whether there is or not god, equally we can't finally settle various theological questions such as the viability of axiarchism, except with the help of decision about the status of ethical values.

13.II Key ideas and sentences

- "That the cause or causes of order in the universe probably bears some remote analogy to human intelligence." - Philo
- **Axiarchism:** Axiarchism would cover all theories that see the world as ruled largely or entirely by value including both the belief in an omnipotent and benevolent creator and the view that all things are animated by a desire for god.
- **Extreme axiarchism:** 'some set of ethical needs is creatively powerful or more epigrammatically that the universes exist because it ought to.'
- **Immanent teleology:** "Things exist and for a goal or end or purpose or final cause, but the purpose is not located in any mind, nor is the goal or end made such by being taken as an end, by desiring or pursuing, nor even by the fact that it would be so taken as an end or would satisfy some desire."

13.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Ontology: Ontology is about concepts such as existence, being, becoming, and reality.

Phenomenalism: the view that all things, including human beings, consist simply of the aggregate of their observable, sensory qualities.

Metaphysical theory: A type of philosophy or study that uses broad concepts to help define reality and our understanding of it.

14 Conclusions and Implications

14.I Summary

A. The Challenge of Nihilism

In this chapter, JL Mackie explains the Hans Kung arguments for existence of god from his work Does god exists? An answer for today. Here Hans Kungs rejects all the existing poofs/arguments given by other philosophers namely ontological proof, cosmological proof and teleological arguments for the existence of God, he further proposes the argument that the very existence of God and reality is strongly denied by the nihilism to which there is no counter argument. Also he does not want to give the proof for the existence of god, but he wanted to give some argument to challenge the nihilism which is does by saying that Affirmation of God implies an ultimately justified fundamental trust in reality. If someone affirms God, he knows why he can trust reality. But there is a flaw in this argument that everything depends on the fundamental trust whether a person trust

in god or not and gives reason to do so and connects this situation with the situation given in the Pascal's Wager. But here he fails in doing so with a conclusive argument.

B. The Balance of Probabilities

Many arguments were presented in earlier chapters, arguments in favour or against of Theism, if combined together some of them may conflict or differ from each other. For eg: Berkeleian god is so different from any view that adds a god. Some of the arguments like ontological proofs are simply considered unsound, which does not add anything advantageous for theism. There is still the possibility for consilience, we can consider miracles, inductive versions of the design and consciousness arguments, cosmological arguments seeking an answer to the question 'Why is there any world at all?', and objective moral values. General strategy to evaluate the possibility of a hypothesis h , balance probabilities between consilience of different considerations which supports the hypothesis while each individual can act against it. But in our case, supposed consilience does not satisfy the requirements of this formal pattern. Some of the considerations are weak due to lack of evidence. The balance bends more against theism, as their probability is quite low considering the arguments. But it can be argued that the probability of the world to be existing is also low, still it exists, it can be same case for god also. The intra conflicts between can be resolved by slight modifications to favour theism, still the balance of probabilities comes out strong against theism. It will also be difficult to defend the religion when its claims, principles or facts cannot be proven rationally.

C. The Moral Consequences of Atheism

Most common obstacle in accepting atheism is the notion that this would be morally and practically disastrous.

There are four kinds of views about morality:

- Commands of a god, with rewards and threats for particular behaviour
- Objectively valid prescriptions, made by human reason or intellect
- Objectively valid principles, but created and sustained by God's existence.
- Developed due to biological and social evolution

If people believing in first and third view start to believe in atheism, his adherence to morality will suffer. But if either the 2nd or 4th view is available to atheist then there is no reason to suppose that such undermining will be either a lasting or a general effect of the decay of religious belief. 4th view is certain to survive even if religion decays.

There are not any simple, better, more empirical, evidence about the contrasting moral consequences of theism and of atheism because even if there is correlation between any one of them and virtue, still we can't establish causal relationship between them.

If moral values are considered as divine commands, so that goodness consisted in conformity to God's will, then claiming that God is good and that he seeks the good of his creation, would make no sense. This fact and the self interest of agent, tend to corrupt morality. Also this interpretation of morality can create a tyrannical, irrational morality as well. Thus Kung says that we are responsible for our own morality. There are some dangers in a distinctively religious morality. But they are dangers only, not inevitable consequences of associating morality with religion. Same things exist in non religious morality as well. Communist parties are expressly anti-religious, and profess an overriding concern with human welfare, but they are also intolerant, ruthless, and, once in power, they too make virtues of tyranny and persecution.

Some weaknesses of moralities are: Conflict between different groups of people due to different moral views, difficult to derive any respect for non-human life, the only reasonable plan is to do the best we can, taking all possible precautions against the worst disasters, but then to meet the uncertainties with cheerful confidence. But to trust God to keep us away from dangers regardless of what actions we do is simply ridiculous.

14.II Key ideas and sentences

- 'Who is God?' and of the God of Israel and of Jesus Christ: after all this, it will be understood why the question 'Does God exist?' can now be answered by a clear, convinced Yes, justifiable at the bar of critical reason.
- God is the close-distant, secular-nonsecular God, who precisely as sustaining, upholding us in all life and movement, failure and falling, is also always present and encompassing us

- God is the living God who in all his indisposability and freedom knows and loves man, acts, moves, and attracts in man's history.
- In God therefore transcendence and immanence coincide . . . Before God, all talk emerges from listening silence and leads to speaking silence.
- By faith I can understand an idea or a decision as a divine inspiration, without detaching the idea or decision from its link with its psychological justification
- Not a blind, but a justifiable belief: a person should not be abused, but convinced by arguments, so that he can make a responsible decision of faith. Not a belief devoid of reality, but a belief related to reality.
- an inductive lead does not seem impossible, attempting to throw light on the experience of uncertain reality, which is accessible to each and everyone, in order thus—as it were, by way of "practical reason", of the "ought", or (better) of the "whole man"—to confront man as thinking and acting with a rationally justifiable decision that goes beyond pure reason and demands the whole person
- Fundamental trust, he adds, is natural to man, it makes us 'open to reality', and 'The Yes can be consistently maintained in practice', whereas the opposite of each of these holds for fundamental distrust (pp. 443-6). There is a 'way of critical rationality' which is 'a middle way between an irrational "uncritical dogmatism" and a "critical rationalism" that also, in the last resort, rests on irrational foundations'; it is a 'completely reasonable risk, which, however, always remains a risk
- We can agree that nothing is to be exempt from criticism, not even the critical method itself, though of course not everything can be criticized at once: while we are examining any one issue, we must take various other things for granted.
- Today less than ever can we call down from heaven ready-made solutions, or deduce them theologically from an immutable universal essential nature of man.
- Any acceptance of meaning, truth and rationality, of values and ideals . . . presupposes a fundamental trust in uncertain reality: by contrast with nihilism, an assent in principle to its fundamental identity, meaningfulness and value . . . Only if the reality of the world and man, as accepted in fundamental trust, is characterized by an ultimate identity, meaningfulness and value, can individual norms of genuinely human behavior and action be deduced in an appropriate way from this reality and—decisively—from the essential human needs, pressures and necessities . . .
- On the basis of fundamental trust, even an atheist can lead a genuinely human, that is, humane, and in this sense moral, life', and that 'Even atheists and agnostics are not necessarily nihilists, but can be humanists and moralists.
- It must now be obvious that the fundamental trust in the identity, meaningfulness and value of reality, which is the presupposition of human science and autonomous ethics, is justified in the last resort only if reality itself—of which man is also a part—is not groundless, unsupported and aimless.
- Affirmation of God implies an ultimately justified fundamental trust in reality. If someone affirms God, he knows why he can trust reality.
- Believing in God as Finisher of the world means coolly and realistically—and even more, without succumbing to the violent benefactors of the people—to work for a better future, a better society, in peace, freedom and justice, and at the same time to know without illusions that this can always only be sought but never completely realized by man.
- Don't tie morality to religious teaching at a time when religious belief is itself fragile.
- We can't establish a causal relationship between theism/atheism and virtue.
- Connecting moral values with divine entity can create tyrannical, irrational morality as well.
- Do the best you can and then meet the uncertainties with confidence.

14.III Glossary of Important Concepts

Nihilism: the denial of three classical transcendentals that there is no unity, no truth and no goodness. This pimpls that there is no god and no reality.

Objectively valid: Whose validity is independent of the agent's belief

14.IV Glossary of Key Arguments

There is no rationally conclusive argument against the possibility of nihilism: Here the proof for the existence of nihilism and along with that the argument given by Hans Kung against the nihilism when tweaked can be used as supporting argument for nihilism.

Conclusion

There exist no well a tested miracles in the world, now for the validation of a certain miracle it should violet the basic laws of nature and the unlikelihood of the miracle should be less than the unlikelihood of the testimony which is conducted for the validation of miracle. Now if the unlikelihood for both the events are same then one should wait till further evidence is bought in light for or against the miracle.

The existence of God has always been a hot topic for philosophers to debate. Many philosophers tried to prove with their novel or modified approaches, but can never say they succeeded to convince others. Among these philosophers, most of them were considered brilliant minds at that time. In chapter 2, Author explore and discusses the third meditation of Descartes. God's existence is the central part of Descartes's system of knowledge. Descartes want to built the foundation in several ways. Author show that the main argument of the 3rd meditation fails, and it fails independently of any doubt. With the help of this author proved that his re-establishment of knowledge on an unshakable foundation fails. In chapter 3, some of the ontological proofs were discussed, also with criticism. The problem with ontological proofs is that they have never been able to convince a rational person with their premises and principles. Hence, in the end, it all boils down to an individual's faith and belief.

In chapter 4, the author gives a brief idea about the idealism of Berkeley and then rival hypothesis materialism. Berkeley tries to prove the traditional theism of God by explaining how reality is constituted. He tries to prove it using Locke's primary and secondary qualities. But the author explains that non of his argument is against materialism. But the author was not able to prove whether idealism constitutes reality or materialism. At the end of the chapter, he says that materialism should be preferred because of modern science as of now.

In chapter 5, the author talks about Cosmological arguments. It is an argument for the existence of God which claims that all things in nature depend on something else for their existence (i.e. are contingent) and that the whole cosmos must therefore depend on a being that exists independently or necessarily. The author has described a different version of cosmological arguments given by philosophers like Leibniz, Aquinas, Al farabi, Craig, Swinburn, Ghazali. In this chapter, all philosophers tried to prove that, God is a necessary being that has its own sufficient reason for existence and who created the universe. But the main weakness in cosmological argument is the Inconsistent notion of a necessary being. The Cosmological argument states that everything must have a cause yet explain this with the idea of an un-caused being who was the first cause. This is inconsistent with the idea of an uncaused cause since the solution itself is an uncaused cause.

Arguments for existence of god is discussed based on morality. Chapter 6 explores first the basic fact that we are scared from doing wrong things because there is someone powerful to give punishment who is God. Then other argument says that we strive to get good everyday, so someone might have achieved all good and would have become perfect being, whom we call God. Then comes the discussion on why we consider some things wrong and other things right, who might have made this connection of rightness/wrongness with the action we are doing? author says that he might be God. Then author says that if we let go of God then there will be no moral values inside us.

In chapter 7, the main Problem is "How could Consciousness arise in a purely material universe?" Many philosophers like Cicero, Locke, Swinburne, Donald Davison have different arguments on this to define consciousness. Locke gave god as the reason. Swinburne gave scientific inexplicability. He gave the concept of dualism and personal explanation. However, at the end of the chapter author doesn't get any clear reason for consciousness.

From Chapter 8 We can conclude that arguments for design cannot be revived, the advancements of science have made them unsubstantiated

In chapter 9, the author tries to answer the problem of evils, after lots of discussion the author has reached the conclusion that evils are the necessary component for the existence of the god, and he also explained the different order of goods and evils. Then he discussed the Paradox of omnipotent, in this he reached to the conclusion that God can not do the logical impossible things, and he also covered the free will defence, god can see the all possible choices that human beings can make, but which choice they will make is solely dependent on the human beings. He also discussed why God wouldn't have created the world in which humans are always free to choose good.

Conclusion in chapter 10 may seem to be a very modest reward for our labors. It leaves open several possibilities for revised religious views and for this author discusses *The Varieties of Religious Experience* and *Natural Histories of Religion* in chapter 10. In religious experience, the author introduces different forms of reliance. any experience connected with something like The pain, or the dream. after that author talk about James's work, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. In this James's interest is solitary experiences of the individual, his psychological point of view, cause of this experience, and his thought on supernatural, reality.to deepen our understanding of this author ask a question like what value is found in these experiences? And what value should we assign to these experiences and how valuable are they? After answering these questions author shows the possibility of religion without belief. In the case of *Natural Histories of Religion*, the author tells religion has a source other than experiences and James's argument on this of a higher realm. after this author discusses Hume's work on this topic "*The Natural History of Religion*", trying to describe religion as a natural phenomenon. where Hume argues about monotheism, polytheism. The author discusses how anthropologists inserted animism and magical belief as a stage preceding the worship of departmental deities and how Tylor and Frazer view magic as pseudo-science and pseudo-technology. Phillips, Ludwig Feuerbach, Marx, Durkheim, Freud, and other psychoanalysts argue about many phenomena-dreams, forces, neuroses, psychoses, economic, mistakes, and slips in point of religion. in end, Phillips, following Wittgenstein, thinks that religion need not and should not be thus understood. thus we examine the possibility of religion without belief in chapter 12.

In chapter 11, author tried to prove that can we believe in god without any reason or evidence? So for that he discussed Pascal's wager in which author doesn't try to prove God's existence but gives some good reasons to believe in god, then gives a more superior argument than pascal which is given by William James. In James's argument he gives us Genuine option to believe on any hypothesis with insufficient evidence.

Through chapter 12, the author wants to ask whether one can understand the "religious belief" or perhaps defend it without including factual beliefs about the typically central religious doctrines. Many philosophers like Wittgenstein, Kierkegaard, DZ Phillips and Braithwaite have their say on this. In this chapter we see how religious believers take the belief and defend it, what is superstition and lastly, Phillips' views on God.

In chapter 13, author tries to answer the question "Replacement of God". He has described what other philosophers like Philo, Plato and John Leslie were thinking about the God. The major theory in this chapter is John Leslie's "Extreme axiarchism". He gives his own variant of the cosmological argument. There are two choices i) the universe or some part bearing creative responsibility for the rest just happens to be there and ii) the universe existing thanks to its ethical requiredness. The writer tells that as we cannot come to the conclusion of some ethical questions about whether there is or not God, equally we can't finally settle various theological questions such as the viability of axiarchism, except with the help of decision about the status of ethical values.

In chapter 14, J.L. Mackie explains the Hans Kung arguments for existence of god from his work *Does god exist?* An answer for today. Here Hans Kung rejects all the existing proofs/arguments given by other philosophers namely ontological proof, cosmological proof and teleological arguments for the existence of God, he further proposes the argument that the very existence of God and reality is strongly denied by the nihilism to which there is no counter argument. Also he does not want to give the proof for the existence of god, but he wanted to give some argument to challenge the nihilism which he does by saying that Affirmation of God implies an ultimately justified fundamental trust in reality. If someone affirms God, he knows why he can trust reality. But there is a flaw in this argument that every thing depends on the fundamental trust whether a person trust in god or not and gives reason to do so and connects this situation with the situation given in the Pascal's Wager. But here he fails in doing so with a conclusive argument. Author claims that if we try to evaluate the probability for the existence of God from the consilience of different considerations, it comes out to be against the existence of God. Hence, it was always hard to fortify religion's claims, factual, literals, etc as they don't have any credulous evidence. Also in this chapter, discussion on how atheism might affect our moral values is done. firstly 4 different views on what morally good values are is given and then follows the discussion on what might happen if we align ourselves with one of the meaning of morality and what are the weakness of some of them.

Evaluation and Review of the book

As per the weakness, here author himself is making the arguments complex for a total beginner in philosophy. There are a lot of sentences and arguments which could have been framed and written in better form for understanding. While the Strength of the book is its detailed arguments and its good reason for discarding any arguments.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part, we discuss and update the existing arguments for the existence of God and in the second part, we discuss justifying belief. Mackie starts the argument with Hume's work on Miracles. Here we can say that to believe in Christianity we first must believe in miracles otherwise it will be very illogical and a similar argument was given by Hume too. After this, there is a deep discussion about

Descartes's ontological proof for the existence of God, in which God is defined as one supreme entity and God is the reason for the existence of reality and the world. But author Mackie is not satisfied with this argument.

Also immaterialist view of Berkley, moral arguments, cosmological arguments, arguments from design and arguments from consciousness are discussed in this part. Then the existence of evil in face of God is discussed which is the most uncomfortable question for a theist. Mackie shows that on logical analysis the argument for existence of evil in the presence of God doesn't stand much chance for belief. Argument of the form that we need a designer for the universe who makes and runs the world with the laws of nature is discussed here with many objections given by Mackie for this argument. Claiming that we can just God's existence and not conclude the fact that he is the creator. Mackie then discusses claims based on natural histories of religion and religious experience and comes on the conclusion that God can't be postulated based on mere fact of these experiences.

Sometimes Author's disbelief is apparent in his arguments. Religion in today's world has a huge influence, religion has psychological and moral impacts on its followers. The author consistently questions "why religious beliefs are there, why is it persistently defended, why are they enforced despite there being no credible proof or reason to believe them to be true" The book can be considered as a comprehensive approach to modern philosophical concepts from an atheist's angle. The content is dense and requires close attention, but tries to avoid jargon. Some terminologies or concepts require a glossary that is not addressed up to mark.