

# You Can't Prove That God Doesn't Exist -- DEBUNKED: A Christian Look

By chance, I came across this video on You Tube. Normally, I ignore such things, but something drew me to it, and I watched it. I was delighted to find a rational argument on the topic, and decided to respond to it. Below is what I wrote in the "comments" section.

Greetings. I really enjoyed your video. You have presented a logical argument and with a rational conclusion. That being said, you are operating on false premises, and as a result, cannot arrive to a correct conclusion. Indeed, with false premises, the better your logic, the worse your conclusions, as faulty logic might at least accidentally bring you back on course.

The first mistake was beginning the problem in the middle. You did not address the issue of Ultimate Causation versus Infinite Regression. Since you did not address it, I will not need to defend my premise that Theism is a legitimate theory concerning the existence of the universe. But even with this failure, you have not completely lost your argument. The question, "If there *is* a god, what *kind* of god is it?" still remains. Is it multiple gods (paganism), a god who made the universe but metaphorically "walked away" (the true definition of deism, not the one you gave at min 4:30), or a god or gods who interact with mankind?

Your second mistake was not one of omission; it was an outright error. Your first definition of god does exclude the pagan gods of worship, but not Jehovah (who does not change), Allah (who can change), Brahma (as originally conceived, not later interpretations), Gaia, and the various Shadow Gods pagans acknowledged but did not interact with (the Native American Great Spirit, the Greek Unknown God, etc.). Your second definition excludes all gods except Jehovah and Allah. All the others that were included in the first definition do not interact with man, so Omnibenevolence seems to discredit them.

Now let us look at the God of Abraham (Yahwey or Jehovah). Looking at the very first chapter of Genesis, we see that it was Jehovah who created the clouds and man, so to picture God as a man (don't know where your idea that he had to be white came from, certainly not the Bible) on a cloud must therefore be a reduction of what Jehovah really is, not the be-all and end-all of what He is. This is the third error. As Jehovah created time and space out of nothing, He must transcend time and space. Jehovah created the universe outside of Himself, so therefore it is wrong to suggest that God as three persons in one is not possible, because God is not bound by the limitations of our time and space. I will revisit this shortly.

I also don't know why you suggested that a transcendent God is a "contemporary" concept, as it does nothing to promote your argument, is misleading, and is actually proven wrong in the very first chapter of the Bible. The book of Genesis was written about 3,400 years ago, and it was based on oral traditions that existed before that. Hardly a "contemporary" idea. But by transcending time and space, this god cannot change. Allah must therefore be discredited because, per 2:106 of the Quo'ran, Allah can change.

If we therefore build on a god who must be transcendent, then we also must accept that He is Omnibenevolent. As He created everything, there is nothing creation can give back to him. To give without receiving is to suggest a self-LESS god, not a selfISH one. This seems to discredit Deism. But I know this was not your point. You claim that we can use this second definition to show contradictions. But here is where you make the forth error. You fail to understand what is being said

about Jehovah.

Your dilemma about God being able to create a rock so big that He couldn't lift it fails to take into account the very transcendence you admit Jehovah is supposed to have. Without time or space, there is no gravity and no "up." A rock has no weight and no direction to be moved. This so-called dilemma is merely words placed together in a grammatically correct order, yet with no meaning. One cannot answer a question that has no meaning. Therefore, there is no debunking of Jehovah with it.

Your argument that Omniscience and Free Will contradict each other is not very well thought out, to the point where you might want to consider dropping it in your apologetics. This isn't even a matter of philosophy; it's a matter of everyday experience. If I were to stand on a hill and see someone driving on the wrong side of the road below me, I can foresee a wreck they will have with oncoming traffic on the other side of the hill. My foresight is not denying their Free Will, as I am not forcing them drive on the wrong side of the road. They can freely move back into the correct lane at any time before the anticipated crash. If a wedding couple have an appropriate amount of chairs and food for wedding guests because they received notices from those invited, this does not suggest the couple forced the guests to show up against their Free Will. If a hotel has a room available because I made a reservation, I will not accuse the hotel from denying me my Free Will when I show up. If a teacher knows many students will get up and run around the room if she has to leave, she is not forcing them to do so. Of course, human foresight is flawed, yet the airline industry (among others) survives on the fact that human foresight is good enough. Jehovah has perfect foresight (Omnipresence and Omnitemporalness), and therefore can plan perfectly for all decisions humans make with their Free Will.

Your argument that Jehovah can't be Omnibenevolent because we should have a much better world also tells me that you have not read even the first three chapters of the first book in the Bible. You seem to have a rather harsh opinion of something you don't understand. We did have a much better world, and man (Adam and Eve) rejected it. One could question how is nature so screwed up because of what man did? I suggest you ask any friends you may have that are Environmentalists to answer that one, because the whole movement is based on the idea that man is screwing up nature. The answer as to why this world is so messed up is because man made it that way, not God.

I actually agree with what Epicurus says. The problem you have in using him to debunk Jehovah is that Jehovah actually did do something to change the problem. Jehovah is both able and willing to fix the problem and He has fixed the problem. Again, if one knew what Jehovah revealed, then one would know about the eternity of paradise He offers (yet which can be rejected) to each and every human (He is therefore willing). God the Son not only humbled Himself to become human, but also accepted the most humiliating and painful way to die for sins He did not commit to free us from the debt of the sins we committed (therefore He was not only able, but has done it). Now, I don't know if this is the only way He could have stopped the pain and suffering, but I don't need to speculate on other options to prove your premise wrong. I only need to show a single way your argument fails. Likewise, you may not be happy with this solution, thinking it is too slow a process, but that is also beside the point.

But, getting back to Epicurus, we have the final question of whence Evil comes. Again, we see this in the 3rd chapter of Genesis. Evil comes from refusing the good. Evil comes from man, through his Free Will, rejecting the good God gave us. Jehovah, being unchanging, cannot contradict Himself. When He gave us Free Will, He accepted rejection as well. If He forceably denied us the ability to reject Him, then He would contradict Himself and you would not need Epicurus. His Omnibenevolence comes from ultimately saving us from ourselves and is demonstrated by the extreme

way He chose to save us.

Almost every argument made here against Jehovah is actually countered by the first three chapters of the first book in the Bible, and almost half of them in the very first chapter.

I look forward to hearing your replies, but my suggestions to you are this:

- 1) Understand the argument of Ultimate Causation versus Infinite Regress. You gave me a massive break by ignoring it.
- 2) Understand the differences between deities. While not as bad as most Atheists, you still seem to think that all gods are the same.
- 3) Make sure you get your terminology right, you made a big mistake with the term "Deist."
- 4) Understand what Christianity really says. I admit that there are a lot of Christians putting out a lot of bad information, so go to good sources. C.S. Lewis's book "Mere Christianity" is a great place to start. It is a fast read, easy to understand and covers a lot of material.
- 5) Don't blame God for human problems. Your comment about God being a "colossal prick" came back to haunt you.

Raymond Mulholland  
Original Publication Date: 7 October 2021

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R3OkCxhjDmQ>