

# Philosophy



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Evaluate the claim that God's existence is not a logical necessity...The ontological argument is an argument for the existence of God it is an a priori argument, and reflects the meaning of the word God. An analytical statement is a statement which is true by definition for example all bachelors are unmarried men and a synthetic statement is a statement that is proved to be true by empirical evidence for example trees produce oxygen.

Descartes thinks that the statement "God exists" is an analytical statement but Paley and Aquinas wanted to prove that God existed with empirical evidence, with synthetic statement. We could ask if there isn't a God then where did the idea come from. Descartes argued that it is irrational to think of God without existence and that it is like thinking of a triangle and not a shape with three angles. For Descartes the essence of God is that God exists and existence is a predicate of God, therefore God exists because existence is a predicate of a perfect being. God is a logical necessity therefore God must exist, this argument was put forward by Anselm he thought that it was possible to conceive of a being, the existence of which is necessary, and God must be such a being if he is anything which has to exist and cannot fail to exist is said by philosophers to exist by necessity. If the most perfect being existed only in thought and not in reality, then it would not really be the most perfect being, for the one that existed in reality would be more perfect. Therefore, concludes Anselm, "no one who understands what God is can conceive that God does not exist". Anselm said that the existence of God was necessary but he didn't give a definition of what was necessary about him.

Therefore we don't know if God is necessary as we don't know what necessary is. Empirical evidence is dominant when deciding whether something is believable or not this could challenge the Ontological argument as no evidence is even suggested to prove the existence of God. People are very focused on what can be sensed or experienced and although this argument may explain what God isn't it offers no explanations as to what he is, or why he exists. I think that without proof the ontological argument is weak as people are not easily convinced without evidence, but the argument is not disproved just weakened by lack of empirical evidence.