

"But, in fact, this argument is only a part of a larger argumentation, which as a whole intends to prove the real distinction of essence and existence in creatures and the identity thereof in God."

All of the religions in the world tell us that we pay for our sins after we die. This means everyone should know and understand the arguments for God's existence.

Metaphysics and science are two separate methods of inquiry that stand beside each other as equals. According to metaphysics, human beings exist and a human being is a composition of two principles: essence and existence. It follows logically from this that there exists a pure act of existence without a limiting essence, which the Near Eastern religions call God.

Philosophy is a method of inquiry above another method. The question of the best way to do science is a philosophical question. Asking whether or not a human is really a composition of essence and existence is a philosophical question. It is worse than discussing how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy recently asked me to document my criticism of their entry on the "cosmological argument." I asked a prominent Catholic scholar for help, and was rebuffed. What follows is excerpts from my email to him:

Dear Fr. XXXXX,

I am trying to understand how a Jesuit priest can say he is not "an expert on the cosmological argument." The Catholic Church teaches that we know God exists from reason. What would you say to a college student who asked you how we know God exists?

My guess is that you would be very troubled by such a question. If you use the scientific argument (What caused the Big Bang?), the student might be intelligent and knowledgeable enough to realize this is an absurd argument. If you give the cosmological argument (What causes finite beings?), the student may not understand the argument.

The other possibility is that the Catholic Church in the United States is promoting the scientific argument and you don't want to antagonize your colleagues.

There is another possible explanation I have for your comment. The cosmological argument is just an argument, not a proof. You can refute the argument by saying it is not persuasive, has no content, and is contradictory. You don't know how to respond to this refutation.

The scientific argument, on the other hand, is not even an argument because it is so absurd. It can be totally squashed by saying the argument is an exercise in circular reasoning. You DO know how to respond to this refutation. What you would say is, "You have a materialistic world view."

I have another explanation for your comment. An honest person would have to admit that you cannot prove God exists. But you can prove that human beings are embodied spirits and that human beings did not evolve from animals. What this means is that anyone who denies this is a liar. Following the principle of not "throwing your pearls before swine," you should sever your relations with people who say human beings evolved from animals. You don't want to do this. You want to keep on good terms with atheists.

Evidence that Fr. Robert Spitzer is especially concerned about keeping good relations with atheists is that he is helping the American Journal of Physics cover up the mistake it made in publishing an article about evolution and the second law of thermodynamics. See

[https://www.academia.edu/20939526/An\\_Analogy\\_Between\\_Nazi\\_Germany\\_and\\_the\\_United\\_States](https://www.academia.edu/20939526/An_Analogy_Between_Nazi_Germany_and_the_United_States)