

- (1) *"The metaphysician believes that he travels in territory in which truth and falsehood are at stake. In reality, however, he has not asserted anything, but only expressed something, like an artist."*

Throughout the history of mankind there has been religion. Many would even go as far as to say religion or spirituality is one of the prerequisites to happiness. However, untainted and pure belief does not come easily to most. In our time and in the ages hence, people have found comfort in stories of miracles and good deeds, as a means to justify this apparently ungrounded belief. However, after the enlightenment people increasingly started to question their beliefs. Leibniz and many others tried to make the existence of god more likely by the sheer power of argument. However, nothing was asserted by his argument. His assertion that the evil in the world most likely is there in order to accentuate the good was a feeble attempt to assert something that may never be asserted. Augustine's 400th century argument is also weak according to many; god is both the axiom and the conclusion of his argument. Consequently, this has lead many to believe that the people trying to make assertions about morality, god and the meaning of life were simply believers with a mission and too much time on their hands. Their work is like poetry; nice to read, difficult and sometimes as impossible to decipher as the problem itself. Is this work nice, but ultimately meaningless because of lack of proof, like Rudolf Carnap seems to believe?

The work of the metaphysicians is an uphill battle, the goal being the assertion of god's existence. With a goal so clearly defined, many would argue the premises of a logical debate is already challenged. However, yet others would see this as a hypothesis being tested by the argument. The real weakness of most of the arguments related to the existence of something otherworldly, is the impossibility of conducting tests and experiments to prove or disprove them. Being simply mind-games played by exceptionally clever people, they lose their value as "proof". However, these clever people may have realised something of the utmost importance; without the assertion of faith, nothing would be moral or immoral. On their quest to find proof, they find practicality. Would anyone act morally if not for the sanctions and demands of a righteous god or power? The philosophers dabbling in this kind of study can therefore rather be beheld as

practical and need-oriented people, rather than artists. Their mission is not to fool, but to open for a possibility.

As previously mentioned, the hypothesis presented by the metaphysicians is hard to prove or disprove. When we in the future look back at our fumbling attempts we might be amazed at how blind we could be. With the current scientific progress, we might be able to find empirical proof of gods' existence sometime in the future. Future "me" may be absolutely convinced that god exists, or future "me" might be laughing at the current me. This was probably how they felt about arguments relating to astronomy before and after it was empirically proven that earth revolves around the sun. Before the discoveries of Galileo Galilei and Isaac Newton, the hypothesis had been widely known, but few dared speak their defence, as they had no proper grounds for their arguments. Maybe all that is needed in order for everything before asserted becomes true, is a change in paradigm, the total transformation of our outlook on life. Although these arguments may perhaps hold validity and even reassurance to many, it doesn't change the work previously done. The work is still based on guesses, assertions, not to mention feelings of the author. Even though their work is perhaps plausible to some, it is not possible to prove empirically, and not even being proven right will change that for everything prior to that. They may be right, but they do not have the means to prove it, making it a work of fiction rather than fact.

Even though an argument is false, does not mean there is nothing to learn from it. At school, teachers often tell us that knowledge has a worth of its own, independent of the validity or practicality of it. Everything done to further the global stockpiles of knowledge is valuable. Sure, the work of the metaphysician will not always be considered knowledge. Nevertheless; who knows what knowledge really is? Is it assertion or proven fact, or is it assertion to a proven fact? Or is it simply the combined mental effort of the entire mankind? Yes, the metaphysician may not be right, but who are we to say his or her work is not valuable?

In conclusion, one could say that a metaphysician simply expresses a view rather than asserting it. However, expressing something can have a worth in itself, just like art. The

practicality of the existence of something metaphysical is self-evident to many - having a belief may strengthen your morals. However, it is not whether it is practical or not that defines whether it is a truth or not – only proof can lead to assertion. Being an otherworldly thing, it will necessarily be difficult to prove in this world. The attempts made by individuals to assert their own belief is not worthless, unimportant or a sign of stupidity – it may on the contrary be worth everything to the person. To the world, the proof may not be sufficient, but to the person convinced, no proof is necessary.