

---

## **UNIT 2    ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD**

---

### **Contents**

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Earlier Arguments for the Existence of God
- 2.3 Scholastic Arguments for the Existence of God
- 2.4 Other Arguments for the Existence of God
- 2.5 Modern Philosophers on Existence of God
- 2.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.7 Further Readings and References

---

### **2.0    OBJECTIVES**

---

This Unit is to give the student some arguments about the Existence of God. The basis for these arguments is reason, but then we realize and have to accept that the topic we are studying, namely, the Existence of God, is such that we cannot come to any universal conclusion, given the topic of our study.

---

### **2.1    INTRODUCTION**

---

Believers might not need proofs for the existence of God, even so we feel the need to speak of arguments in favour of the existence of God. On the other hand most non-believers or atheists would not feel the need of proving their non-belief or non-acceptance of God, because they see this as most natural. The responsibility then seems to be on the believers to give some arguments to prove the existence of God. While we agree that there can never be a universal proof for the existence of God, even so we can definitely speak of arguments in favour of the existence of God. The aim of this chapter is to examine certain arguments that have traditionally been used to prove or demonstrate the existence of God. We shall examine different types of arguments and we shall also look at some individual philosophers who had significant arguments to prove the existence of God.

---

### **2.2    EARLIER ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD**

---

#### **Augustine**

The God of Augustine is the idealization of everything that man considers good and worthy. He is absolute power, perfect goodness, the source and creator of everything. He knows everything and has so controlled the universe that everything is determined by him forever. St. Augustine's central proof of God's existence is from thought, the proof from within. It begins from the apprehension of the mind of necessary and changeless truths which is present to all. This

truth is superior to the mind which cannot change it or amend it. The mind varies in its apprehension of truth, but truth remains ever the same. Eternal truths must be founded on being and reflect the Ground of all truth. They reflect the necessity and immutability of God who is the Ground of eternal and necessary truth. St. Augustine also seeks to prove the existence of God from the external and corporeal world but these are more like hints, or reminders. He was keen to show that all creation proclaims God who is recognized in the dynamic attitude of the soul towards God. The soul seeks happiness, and some seek it outside themselves. St. Augustine tries to show that creation cannot give the soul the perfect happiness it seeks, but points upwards to the living God who must be sought within. He seeks to demonstrate the existence of God from his effects. He views the rational knowledge of God in close connection with the search of the soul for the Truth which is a kind of self revelation of God to the soul.

### **Anselm**

The first type of argument that is used to show the existence of God is the ontological argument, and it is so called because it attempts to show that the very concept of the idea of God implies his existence in reality. That is to say, if a person is able to clearly conceive the idea of God then he or she ought to be able to understand and accept that God must exist. It was St. Anselm, the eleventh century Archbishop of Canterbury who first gave a serious formulation of this argument. His argument was as follows:

God is the greatest possible being. He is “That than which nothing greater can be thought”. God exists at least in the mind or understanding. A being who exists only in the mind is not so great as a being who exists in reality as well as in the mind. If God existed only in the mind, he would not be the greatest possible being. So “that than which nothing greater can be thought” must exist in the mind as well as in reality. Hence, God must exist in reality. (as well as in the mind.) This argument met with many objections because of its claim that the existence of something can be inferred merely from its definition.

Gaunilo a contemporary of Anselm produced a parallel argument, substituting the concept of God with that of the “most perfect island”. Following this argument, logically the ‘most perfect island’ must exist in reality. But it was not the case, thus proving the argument wrong. But Anselm replied that this argument applied only to God, because the concept of God is unique in the sense that God is the only necessary being. All other beings, as the ‘island’ are finite objects and hence not necessary. Hence we can always conceive a more perfect island, but God is already the greatest possible being, and nothing greater can be thought of. We cannot think of a merely perfect God, while we can always think of a more perfect island.

Immanuel Kant also objected to this argument, because he said, that one cannot legitimately think of ‘existence’ as a property which an entity may or may not have, or have to varying degrees. When we say of something that it exists, we are talking of it as already actualized. Existence is not a ‘property’ of a thing as for instance its being red or blue or yellow. So it cannot be a property that adds something to the greatness of God. From Anselm’s argument it appears as if existence in reality adds something to the greatness of God.

---

## 2.3 SCHOLASTIC ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

---

### Aquinas

Another argument that strives to prove the existence of God is the so called Cosmological argument. This argument strives to proceed from the fact of the existence of the world to a transcendent creator. These arguments originate in the thinking of Aristotle and have been presented by Thomas Aquinas who used Aristotle's ideas as the intellectual medium to put down his own religious philosophy. These are commonly referred to as the Five Ways of St. Thomas. His arguments could be presented as follows.

**From Motion:** Everything that moves is moved by something. That mover is in turn moved by something else again. But this chain of movers cannot be infinite or movement would not have started in the first place. Therefore, there must be an unmoved mover. (whom we call God.)

**From the Nature of the Efficient Cause:** Everything has a cause. Every cause itself has a cause. But you cannot have an infinite number of causes. Therefore, there must be an uncaused cause, which causes everything to happen without itself being caused by anything else. Such an uncaused cause is what people understand by 'God.'

**From Possibility and Necessity:** Individual things come into existence and later cease to exist. Therefore at one time none of them was in existence. But something comes into existence only as a result of something else that already exists. Not all things can be ONLY possible. There must be one that is of itself Necessary. Therefore, there must be a being whose existence is necessary, 'God'.

**Teleological Argument** is related to the sense of the word 'telos' which signifies the meaning, end or purpose. Here we are speaking of the telos, of the world. In a way this argument also argues that the sense of purposeful design that we see in nature suggests that the world has a designer, namely God. That is why this argument is also referred to as the Way of Design or the Fourth Way of Aquinas. Thomas Aquinas links the idea of causation to that of purpose. He says that causation gives things their perfection. And then he links this to the idea of purpose. He holds that goal directed behavior is in all beings, even if they lack awareness. Such beings that lack awareness are directed to their goal by someone who has the awareness and understanding that they themselves lack. Everything in nature is directed to its goal.

### Al-Kindi and Al-Ghazali – *Kalam* Cosmological Argument

The *Kalam* Argument for the existence of God originated and became highly developed in Islamic theology during the late Middle Ages. It gets its name from the word "*kalam*", which refers to Arabic philosophy or theology. It is an Arabic term that literally means 'argue' or 'discuss', though it has also been translated as 'theology' or 'dialectical theology'. Traditionally the argument was used to demonstrate the impossibility of an actual infinite existing in the real world, as well as an argument from temporal regress, thus showing that the universe cannot be eternal.

Everything that begins to exist has a cause of its existence. (Causal principle.)

The universe (space, time, and matter) began to exist. (Evidenced by two philosophical arguments, the Big Bang, and the second law of thermodynamics.)

Therefore, the universe has a cause of its existence.

Sub-argument:

As the cause of the universe (space, time, and matter), the cause must be outside of space, time and matter, and therefore be spaceless, timeless, and immaterial. Moreover, the cause must be a personal agent, otherwise a timeless cause could not give rise to a temporal effect like the universe. (Argument expanded.)

This is an accurate picture of God.

Therefore, God exists.

The first premise of the argument is the claim that everything that begins to exist has a cause of its existence. In order to infer from this that the universe has a cause of its existence the proponent of the *kalam* cosmological argument must prove that the past is finite, that the universe began to exist at a certain point in time. The crucial premise of the *kalam* cosmological argument, then, is the second: “The universe has a beginning of its existence”. How do we know that the universe has a beginning of its existence? Might not the universe stretch back in time into infinity, always having existed? The proponent of the *kalam* cosmological argument must show that this cannot be the case if his argument is to be successful.

### Check Your Progress I

**Note:** Use the space provided for your answers.

1) What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the Ontological Argument

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What are the different types of Cosmological Arguments?

.....

.....

.....

.....

### Bonaventure

While St. Bonaventure supported the relation of philosophy and theology, he did formulate arguments for the existence of God. He philosophizes in the light of what he already believes in. His arguments are rational and he makes no reference to dogma in them. Yet he pursues his arguments in the light of the faith which he possesses. In *De Mystério Trinitatis* (5,29) Bonaventure gives a series of brief arguments for the existence of God. He says if there is a being from another, there must exist a being which is not from any other, because

nothing can bring itself out of a state of non-being into a state of being, and finally there must be a first Being which is self-existent. Again, if there is possible being, being which can exist and being which can not exist, there must be a being which is Necessary, that is a being which has no possibility of non-existence, since this is necessary in order to explain the reduction of possible being into a state of existence. If there is a being, a potency, there must be a being in act, since no potency is reducible to act except through the agency of what is itself in act. Ultimately, there must be a being, which is pure act, without any potentiality, God. Every human being has a natural desire for happiness, which consists in the possession of the supreme Good, which is God. Therefore, every human being desires God. However, there can be no desire without some knowledge of the object. Therefore, the knowledge that God or the supreme Good exists is naturally implanted in the soul. The human will is naturally orientated towards the supreme Good, which is God, and this orientation of the will is inexplicable unless the supreme Good, God, really exists.

### John Duns Scotus

In his commentary on *the Sentences*, Scotus argues as follows. We have to proceed from creatures to God by considering the causal relation of either efficient or final causality. Contingent being, is caused by nothing, or by itself, or by another. As it is not possible for it to be caused by nothing or by itself, it must be caused by another. If that other is the first cause, then we have found what we are looking for. If not, then we need to proceed further. But in the vertical order we cannot proceed forever searching for this dependence. Nor can we suppose that contingent being cause one another because then we shall proceed in a circle without arriving at any ultimate explanation of contingency. We cannot escape by saying that the world is eternal, since the eternal series of contingent beings itself requires a cause. Similarly in the order of final causality there must be a final cause which is not directed to any more ultimate final cause. The first efficient cause acts with a view to the final end. But nothing other than the first being itself can be its final end. So the first efficient cause cannot be of the same nature as the effect, but must transcend all its effects. And as first cause it must be the most eminent being.

**William Paley** (1743 – 1805) gave the example saying that if one was to find a watch lying on the ground, one would assume that it had a maker and had been designed by a watch maker. This would be natural because one can see immediately that it is made up of different parts which work together. They work in harmony to tell us the time. The world too he says is like a machine, with different parts designed so that they have a part to play in the whole. The intricate design of the world in which, like the watch, different parts worked together in such a way that suggested a complex design and planning. The design is such that when looked at as a whole one cannot but think of the designer of the world, who is God. Religious common sense tends to look at the intricacy of nature as pointing to a God who is the designer and provides a purpose to creation. There is no evidence to sustain an analogy between human creativity and the idea of a divine creator. It is difficult to sustain the teleological approach as a logical argument. At the best we can only say that the world appears to have some order and purpose. For the believer, it supports his or her belief. But to the atheist, it is logically inconclusive.

## 2.4 OTHER ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

### Moral Argument

This line of argument examines those aspects of human experience which relate to religion. It asks whether there is anything in the way in which people respond to the idea of God which can be used to prove that God exists. One possibility is the experience of morality, namely that we have a sense of what we ought to do and also a sense of guilt when one realizes that one has done what is believed to be wrong. The second possibility is the religious experience itself. Moral rules arise as God's commands, from an objective look at human nature and the structures of the world or as the product of human society and human choice. We look at the second possibility. Aristotle related morality to his idea of a final cause. He held that we ought to do that which leads to our maximum self fulfillment. Once we discover our true nature we will want to act accordingly. By this approach we could say that morality is rational and objective. If one experiences moral obligation, it implies that one is free to act and that one will experience happiness as a result of virtue. For this to be possible there has to be some overall ordering principle which will reward virtue with happiness, and this might be called God. This was the argument of Kant. He seemed to be saying that you cannot prove the existence of God, but one's sense of morality implies that the world is ordered in a moral way, and that this in turn implies belief in God.

If one believes that there is an objective moral order, it may be used either to suggest that the world is created by a moral being, God, or to show that morality is well established on objective rational grounds and no God is needed. On the other hand, if morality is a human product, no God is required to account for moral experience. Hence the moral argument cannot prove the existence of God. At most it can illustrate the way in which the idea of God is used in situations where there is a moral choice to be made. This is the Fifth Way of St. Thomas.

### Argument From Religious Experience

There is in every person the capability of self-transcendence in every experience. That is to say, a very ordinary this-worldly experience seems to point beyond itself and reveals something about the meaning of life as a whole. It reveals to us the religious and the transcendent dimension. Some people do use this as an argument for the existence of God. For those who have had a religious experience it is impossible to prove the non existence of God. One cannot argue against their experience. But then the issue is that there are various ways of interpreting what has been experienced. What one person calls God may have a perfectly rational explanation to someone else. While we could be mistaken about an experience, it is also possible that we might have a correct experience and have truly experienced God. This is true also of our religious experience. But this requires a previous knowledge of what God is so that we can say whether the experience is correct or not.

The problem is that such knowledge is not possible of God. Because if there was such knowledge then there would be no discussion on the existence of God, because if God exists then his existence would be evident to all and there would be no such debate. Hence if religious experience is a source of knowledge



of God, it remains convincing only to those who accept or share this experience. But to the philosopher, the proposition 'God exists' can be either correct, incorrect or meaningless. Religious experience can thus become the basis for the argument for the existence of God only when all people accept one definition of the word 'God'. If religious experience according to different cultures can be found to have a common core, then there is hope of coming to a common understanding of the term 'God'. But if we do not arrive at a common core then most will be unconvinced by the argument from religious experience. This argument may be enlightening and persuasive, but it is not logically compelling. That is why this argument is not much liked by philosophers. However for people with a religious mind, it is the most persuasive of all arguments.

---

## 2.5 MODERN PHILOSOPHERS ON EXISTENCE OF GOD

---

### *Descartes*

Descartes has "proved" the existence of God by way of the Cogito argument. Descartes offers two arguments for the existence of God. The first, considered in Meditation Three, is known as the "Trademark Argument." The second, proposed in Meditation Five, is called the "Ontological Argument." The Trademark Argument arises out of the fact claimed by Descartes that there is within each of us an idea of a supreme being, which was placed within us by the thing that created us. The purpose of this idea was to act as the mark of a tradesman placed within us. From examination of this idea, it follows, says Descartes, that God exists. His argument firstly involves the acknowledgement of such an idea within ourselves. This idea of God is one of a being who is "eternal, infinite, omniscient, omnipotent, and the Creator of all things that exist..."

The primary argument made by Descartes in meditation five is demonstrating that God exists because God is a perfect being and that existence is necessary for perfection. Descartes uses analogies such as the relationship between a mountain and a valley. The mountain and the valley are dependent on one another and proving that one exists will prove that the other exists also. This case is showing that if one were to find a mountain, one would know that there is a valley somewhere nearby. This case does not prove that any mountain or valley exists, but it does prove that if you were to find one you would find the other.

Descartes applies this argument to God and perfection. First he makes the claim that God is perfect. Part of our agreed definition for God is, simply that God is perfect. Then Descartes goes on to attribute perfection to existence. "Existence is a perfection" Descartes makes it very clear that existence is a necessary part for perfection. *Substance* is the primary determination- *accident* adds quality to it- is a secondary determination. 'Substance is one, which requires nothing else other than itself in order to exist.' God is the substance which is infinite, independent, all knowing, all powerful and by which man and all that exist have been created. God is the pure subject- Other creatures too can be called substance in as much as they depend on god.

Through the process of abstraction we get the idea of perfect being from a limited and imperfect being. God – means who has all perfections in an unlimited way. Existence is perfection- so He should have existence. Perfection is further divided into Essential and Existence. God's existence follows from the fact that

existence is contained in the “true and immutable essence, nature, or form” of a supremely perfect being. Descartes as a conceptualist takes essences to be ideas in human minds. Existence is included in the essence of a supremely perfect being, but not in the essence of any finite thing. Thus, it follows solely from the essence of the former that such a being actually exists.

Descartes’ final position then is that essence and existence are identical in all things. What distinguishes God from creatures is his grade of existence. We can produce an ontological argument for God, and not for finite substances, because the idea of a supremely perfect being uniquely contains necessary — or ontologically independent of existence. The former adds to what one is and the latter makes our very being-not adding something and not becoming a part of what we are. Hence, there is a need to assert God as *substance* and the inevitability of his Existence, which is thus proved.

### *Spinoza*

He is a God Intoxicated man as Germans brand him. He comes out with the philosophy of ONENESS or UNIFICATION. The Substance exists by itself and by itself alone – bodies and minds do not come under this, for they exist by virtue of the divine activity. God alone can be the absolute and infinite substance. God has two relatively infinite attributes – Extension and thought. Extension is modified and forms thoughts. Thought is infinitely diversified and forms minds. Mind and matter or in other words, soul and body are manifestation of a common principle. Everything is basically one. A tailored definition of substance from Descartes is vividly seen; *Substance is that which can be understood without the help of any other thing*. Under his vision of the scheme of things God and soul or substance and mode difference is obliterated. Soul in its functions is connected with the life of a body which is perishable but is immortal in its divine part, the intellect. God banishes from the soul of the philosopher all fear of death, and fills him with an unmixed joy.

### *Leibniz*

He is the first one to give us a word ‘theodicy.’ His indeterminism, many realities were all opposed to the one reality and determinism of Spinoza. He brings in the concept of *Monad* and further proceeds to expound the theory of pre-established Harmony. Divine intervention needed for the soul and body to agree. God regulates the soul by the body or body by the volitions of the soul, as a watchmaker constantly regulates one clock by the other. God becomes the unskilful watchmaker unable to create a perfect machine - needing winding up the clock from time to time, continuous repair, the oftener mending it, the poorer a mechanic is lacking sufficient insight to make it run forever. Theological rationalism – or Leibnizian rationalism – subordinates the will of God to divine reason and its eternal laws. The God of Leibniz is a sovereign bound by laws which he cannot unmake, a kind of constitutional King and Chief Executive of the universe rather than all powerful divine. The supreme power is not the will of God *taken by itself*, but his will governed by his eternal laws of his intelligence, laws that determine his conduct without constraining him, since they constitute the very essence of his nature. The Supreme Being is nature manifesting itself through the medium of a personal will.

### *Hume*

Hume considers that in respect of ‘our idea of God’ we have no relevant



impression(s) that can serve as the origin of this idea. His rigorous premise that our ideas reach no further than our experience makes him skeptical about the traditionally held proofs especially those having recourse to Causality. Being an empiricist he held that the existence of God can not be proved on the basis of experience neither he is the subject of belief or faith. Human reason is incapable of apprehending the reality of God. Proofs are misleading and futile. The argument for God's existence, intelligence and goodness from design — based on our observation of beauty and order in the world, the veil of orthodoxy are refuted thus.

- A. Argument from analogy is futile. Things such as heat, cold and gravitation etc., cannot be explained on the basis of thought or reason. Laws of human life differ from that of animal life and the purpose one discovers in human life cannot be imposed upon other forms of existence- so better not to deduce the fact of the existence of God from the fact of universal existence.
- B. Whole- not the basis of part; Thought, reason and purpose are only part of creation- don't use it to analyze the entire creation. Human world and natural world are different and one cannot be used to deduce the other.
- C. God doesn't resemble Human mind. Man's mind is subject to incessant change and to conceive of God as being similar to the human mind is rather fallacious.
- D. Nature of God derived from nature of creation. Creation is not perfect and so logical conclusion would be that God too is imperfect. Nature as the basis of comparison would lead us to conceive of God who cannot satisfy us.

Reasoning or arguments of any kind fails. The true roots theism can be discovered in the psychological dynamics that first give rise to polytheism. The same (irrational) forces that shape polytheism serve to explain the rise of theism and the instability and variations that we discover within it. God's being is "so different, and so much superior" to human nature that we are not able to form any clear or distinct idea of his nature and attributes, much less one based on our own qualities and characteristics. We cannot prove the accuracy of belief, namely God as the author of life, on the basis of our experience because it is limited and imperfect. Better to detest from conceiving god as the creator of mechanical instrument. God as *the soul of the universe* would better suffice us.

God as the cause of all morality not assumed since it is not out of experience. Our experience does not vouch for any moral order in the universe. It is wrong to assume that God is moral even though man's reason is incapable of realizing this fact. Besides various elements of human nature operate independently from our religious beliefs i.e., pride, sympathy, moral sense etc. When we do not know the nature of god, we can not argue about his existence on the basis of this nature. The belief in God arises rather out of man's *physical* and *psychological needs*. Thus the ontological proofs are refuted.

### **Philosophy of Irreligion**

We can describe Hume as a "skeptic" or "agnostic" as concerns his fundamental views on religion. These labels incorrectly suggest that on this issue Hume's position is one of intellectual "neutrality" — taking no stand for or against

religion. The most accurate and informative label for describing Hume's views on this subject, would be is '*irreligion*' which would avoid any serious misrepresentation. Calling Hume's views on this subject *irreligious* avoids, on one side, attributing any form of unqualified or dogmatic atheism to him, while, on the other, it also makes clear that his fundamental attitude towards religion is one of systematic hostility and criticism (i.e., he believes that we are better off without religion and religious hypotheses and speculations). It captures the full strength and scope of Hume's skeptical stance concerning the metaphysical claims of orthodox religion. This covers not just his views about the being and attributes of God but also his views about the soul and a future state, miracles and the foundations of morality. The label of irreligion serves effectively to identify these wider concerns and places appropriate emphasis on Hume's destructive intent in respect of religious systems. Hume's avowal is to discredit the metaphysical and moral paraphernalia of orthodox religious systems and to redirect human investigations to the study of the "science of man", whereby we may develop a secular, scientific account of the foundations of moral and social life.

### ***Kant's Idea of God***

An idealist, profounder of critical philosophy Kant argues that all types of proofs are fallacious. The ontological arguments fail because it treats existence as if it were a 'real predicate.' It is not a concept of something which could be added to the concept of a thing. It is merely the positing of a thing or of certain determinations as existing in them. Even if existence is not 'predicate' it is nevertheless indubitable and certain. An alternative proof would be if one posits something as possible-the notion, do exist and that indeed absolutely necessarily exists-this complete reality be united in a simple being-thus a need of a perfect being, that accounts for the possibility or what so ever.

The causal argument fails because it uses the category of cause without realizing that only in the schematized form is the category significant; because it assumes that the only way to avoid an actually an infinite causal series in the world is to posit a first cause- also pre-supposes, identifies the *necessary being* or first cause with God. His critique of speculative theology is found in the '*the idea of pure reason*'. Kant stated the practical necessity for a belief in God in his *Critique of Practical Reason*. As an idea of pure reason, we do not have the slightest ground to assume in an absolute manner; the object of this idea, but that the idea of God cannot be separated from the relation of happiness with morality as the "ideal of the supreme good." The foundation of this connection is an intelligible moral world, and "is necessary from the practical point of view". He says "One cannot provide objective reality for any theoretical idea, or prove it, except for the idea of freedom, because this is the condition of the moral law, whose reality is an axiom. The reality of the idea of God can only be proved by means of this idea, and hence only with a practical purpose, i.e., to act as though (*als ob*) there is a God, and hence only for this purpose". Voltaire's contention "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him" becomes true in Kant's statement.

The moral proof which is based on the purposiveness in the moral order, on the existence of the moral law, on the phenomenon of moral conscience and the feeling of responsibility, is peremptory from the standpoint of practical reason & even as a pure theory it shares the weakness of the teleological proof of which it is, at bottom, merely a variation. Thus the moral proof of God's existence neither begins from a concept nor from a fact about the world but

from an immediately experienced moral situation. Thus God is the highest idea, the idea of highest unity, of the one absolute whole including and encompassing everything. This idea transcends experience, and it is one of the results of reason which brings under one head all happenings. The impossibility of experience of whole universe makes *this idea an entity of this whole*, personified as God. This idea of whole, belief in His Existence is necessary for moral life, serving as foundation for our ethical principles. The *categorical imperative*, always act so that one can will the maxim or determining principle of one's action, inherent in reason itself, accounting for the 'good will' - all become proof of God who possesses our moral ideas, having absolute power, perfectly wise, good and powerful to join happiness and goodness. Yes we cannot experience God through reason yet reason can bring God back as a necessary unknown. Using the name of god one must live a good moral life- bad life will bring evil.

- The ontological proof fails—the idea of God assures us the objective existence of a Supreme Being. It seems to be an unwarranted and flimsy conclusion indeed.
- The cosmological argument fails-it falsely assumes that there can be no infinite series of cause and effects without the first cause-for avoiding infinite regression posit a first and necessary cause. Yet there is yawning chasm which separates the necessary from the contingent and the absolute from the relative. Even if granting the cogency of the proof it would be more of a personal being than a necessary being.
- The teleological or physico-theological proof infers from the finality revealed in nature the existence of an intelligent creator. Though impressive it has no value from scientific point of view.

The real God of Kant is freedom in the service of the ideal, or good will. Kant's theology is merely an appendix to his ethics. The personal God of Kant reminds us of the celebrated epigram of the contemporary philosopher, if there were no God we should have to invent one.

### Check Your Progress II

**Note:** Use the space provided for your Answers.

- 1) Define the key concepts in Descartes: substance, accidents and innate ideas.

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) Explain the failure of ontological and causal arguments in proving the existence of God in the Kantian perspective.

.....

.....

.....

3) How does Hume refute the age-old proofs for the existence of God?

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 2.6 LET US SUM UP

---

The traditional theodicy provides us with the sufficient material with proofs for and against the existence of God. Here we deal with the modern philosophers' arguments either proving it directly or in an in-direct way disproving the former attempts and establishing one's own attempts. We start with the rationalists, proceeding to empiricists and culminating our study with the idealists. Only selected few philosophers are taken for our study for leaving the rest is due to time and space constraints. All the same students can further their exploration incorporating them in their personal study.

---

## 2.7 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

---

Britannica Great books 31, 33 *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Descartes Books No. 15, 4, 25, 26 and 3.

Copleston Fredric.S.J. *A History of Philosophy*. New York Image Books, 1960.

Darrel E. Christensen. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*. Vol. I, 1970.

Edward, Paul. Ed. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Vol 4. 1967; Rpt. New York: Macmillan Publishing co., Inc., 1972.

Hunnex, Milton.D. *Chronological and Thematic charts of Philosophies and philosophers*. Oxford: Chandler Publishing Co., 1968.

J.N. Findlay. *Hegel a Re-examination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Popkin, Richard.H, Avrum Stroll. *Philosophy*. Oxford: Butterworth- Heinemann Ltd.,1993.

Roy Archana. *Western Philosophy*. New Delhi: Gitanjali publishing house, 1985.

Vatsayan, Dr. *History of Western Philosophy*. Meerut: Kedarnath Ramnath, 1970.