

Transcendental Argument for the existence of God

Transcendental argument attempts to prove that the Christian God is the precondition of all human knowledge and experience, by demonstrating the impossibility of having logic, reason, or morality without God. The argument proceeds as follows:

1. Knowledge is possible
2. If there is no god, knowledge is not possible
3. Therefore God exists

The TAG argues that, because the triune God of the Bible, being completely logical, uniform, and good, exhibits a character in the created order and the creatures themselves, human knowledge and experience are possible. This reasoning implies that all other world views, when followed to their logical conclusions, descend into absurdity, arbitrariness or inconsistency. One aspect on the TAG regards objective morality. The argument asserts that an omnibenevolent God provides the basis for attributing right and wrong to any thought or action. In creation God equips humanity to act as moral beings, and in self-revelation God demonstrates how people should act, and commands them to do so. People then have an objective source for their standard of morality by which to condemn evil thoughts and actions. No moral assertions, it is argued, can be explained by the relativist's worldview; they are instead derived from unconsciously "borrowed capital" from Christianity, proving the truth of the Christian worldview. Matthew Slick's TAG is an attempt to demonstrate the existence of God using logical absolutes. The oversimplified argument goes as follows: logical absolutes exist, logical absolutes are conceptual by nature, are not dependent on space, time, physical priorities, or human nature. They are not the product of the physical universe, because if the physical universe disappear, logical absolutes would still be true. Logical absolutes are not the product of human minds, because human minds are different, not absolute. But, since logical absolutes are always true everywhere, and not dependent upon human minds, it must be an absolute transcendent mind that is authoring them. This mind is called God. Greg Bahnsen offered a defense against all criticisms of TAG, entitled "The transcendental argument for God's existence", which examines the TAG along with the transcendental arguments in the contemporary philosophical literature and defends them against objections. As the most common objection is the claim that the TAG involves circularity, the defense will be briefly outlined. Proponents of the argument claims that worldview level considerations are supposed to be circular as a sign of internal cohesion. In dealing with the inevitable circularity of worldviews, Bahnsen maintains that two criteria must be met to demonstrate a given worldview as true:

1. Internal consistency – the statements made by the worldview do not contradict one another or otherwise lead to internal contradictions. Logical Positivism fails this test by its claim that "A statement is literally meaningful if and only if it is either analytic or empirically verifiable, "a statement that is not itself verifiable analytically or empirically.
2. Arbitrariness – the statements must not be believed simply out of convenience, tradition, or prejudice

Several criticisms of the TAG have emerged. One says that TAG is not a distinctive form of argument: this objection claims that the form of the TAG is really just a reworking of the standard deductive and inductive forms of reasoning; it claims that there is really not much difference between Thomas Aquinas and Cornelius Van Til. The TAG does not fulfill the necessary prerequisites for an Argument of Proof – that is, to have already proved the foundational premises before the conclusion is made. Any premise that has not been proved, by its very nature, is an assumption and is considered to be begging the question. An assumption, by definition, might be wrong. Therefore, an Argument of Proof cannot be based on foundational premises that are assumptions. Every premise must be proven prior to the conclusion being made. Those versions of TAG that are dependent on the foundational premise that “something not conceptual must be physical” yet this notion has not been proved. Therefore, that premise is an assumption. Thus TAG cannot be offered as proof. The TAG moves from conceptual necessity to necessary existence. This criticism argues that proving the conceptual necessity of a worldview doesn’t establish its ontological reality. In other words: one may need think about the world in a certain way in order to make sense of one’s experience and knowledge, but that doesn’t prove that the world actually is that way. David P. Hoover has raised this objection in his article “For the sake of Argument”. The TAG uses another form of begging the question, circular reasoning: the TAG assumes, from the beginning, what it intends to establish by its conclusion. The TAG does not provide a uniqueness proof: even if the TAG can prove the existence of a god, it doesn’t prove that of the Christian god. Any sufficiently similar god, such as Allah, would do. John Warwick Montgomery presented this objection in the article “Once upon an A Priori...”, presented in Van Til’s festschrift, Jerusalem and Athens. In argumentation, apologists will attempt to demonstrate that only the Christian worldview satisfies these conditions and is therefore coherent. However, Van Tillian presuppositionalists also point out that these conditions are applicable only because they themselves presuppose Christianity. To say that Christianity is true because it meets these conditions is to say that a greater standard exists than that of the God of the Bible. However, if you accept the fundamental Christian assertion that the Bible is the direct word of God, then such a charge would be without warrant as the Bible would then be the final epistemological authority of Christianity. Using this rationale, the preconditions of intelligibility are determined merely by Scripture not by autonomous human reasoning. But the divine origins of the Bible are not universally accepted, and the idea of the Bible being a product of man rather than being from a divine source has been debated in modern circles since at least 1878 when Julius Wellhausen first published *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. The question has yet to be definitively answered by scholars. A critique of the argument from morality is that since there is no evaluative domain from which to demonstrate a source for morality, it can’t be said that morals are anything more than opinions that we force other people to follow. On the other hand, it cannot be demonstrated that the source is absolutely subjective either. Without a measurable source of morality, it cannot be demonstrated absolutely that morality has either an objective or subjective source. Criticism of Matt Slick’s version of TAG says that it can be dismissed because logical absolutes are truth statements based on the law of identity, and are not things. When these are confused, the argument becomes circular. A truth statement is a concept, which does not exist without a mind to think it, as stated in Matt’s definition. For example, if you make the law of identity statement, “This apple is an apple, and it is not not an apple”, the truth about the apple is not contingent on the mind making the statement, the statement itself is the thing contingent on the mind. At the point of this confusion, the argument becomes circular, a form of begging the question, and offers of an explanation are not necessary since the premise is flawed and no logical syllogism can be made.

After all these criticisms and defense on existence of God, my position remains the same, I believe that GOD exists, I don’t care on what they said about looking for proof of His existence, for me He do exists, I don’t have a proof if He really do, but me and my family share the same FAITH in Him, and

this faith will never falter with any criticism. Faith is a choice of every individual; it is believing all of the Christian worldview or not.