

GOD

1. Science, history, and other intellectual pursuits depend upon inquiry.
2. Inquiry is inauthentic if it sidesteps the question of ultimate explanations.
3. An ultimate explanation must be something that needs no further explanation, that is that leaves no question unanswered.
4. The only conceivable thing of this sort is something that understands absolutely everything, including, of course, itself.
5. Its self-understanding is central to it. Its understanding of all other things, and of all intelligible possibilities, must flow from its insight into itself.
6. The name we give to this thing is God. If there is such a thing then science, history, literature, and common sense activities make good sense, and their value has backing. If there is not, then nothing can make any sense at all, and all values are undermined.
7. We can all know what such a God must be like. Because we all have had the experience of understanding something, and at times we have experienced exciting, powerful, sudden insights. God's life is wonderful.
8. On the other hand, we have no direct access at all to this insight in the mind of God. So we cannot set limits to his knowledge or prescriptions for his actions. Just as at times I can be satisfied that a teacher understands what he is trying to teach me but I cannot as yet make head or tail of it.

See:

J. M. Finnis, Natural Law and Natural Rights, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980, Ch. XIII, "Nature, Reason, God".

Hugo Meynell, The Intelligible Universe, London: Macmillan, 1982.

Bernard Lonergan, Insight, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1957.