

The arguer's claim is that God (as you understand him) could not exist. He thinks we think, "If God exists, then He must be able to do (i.e., may do) all things."

Arguer's Claim: God does not exist. (If he, the omnipotent God did exist, then, even still, he couldn't do all things—contrary to what you Christians believe)

Argument: Let's Assume that the God you say exists can do all things. Can this God make something so big that He cannot pick it up?

*If He can, then He cannot do all things because He could not pick up the rock.

*If He cannot, then He cannot do all things because He cannot make a rock so big that He cannot pick it up.

(summarizing the "**"; of either being able to create such an immovable object, or not Being able to create it. In either case they're trying to trap you.)

Conclusion:

Since God, by virtue of His existence, can do all things (as you Christian's say), and we have shown that there are things He cannot do, therefore, God does not exist.

In Symbol:

Key:

P=God exists

Q=he can do all things

Structure:

Modus Tollens---(utilizing contrapositive):

$p \rightarrow q$

$\sim q$

Therefore: $\sim p$

Claim: Really: $\sim P$, but $P \rightarrow Q$; Q is not possible, so $\sim Q$ is true, so $\sim P$ is true. (I don't believe the all powerful God of yours exists, but if "God" exists, then he can't do all things, so your God, as you define him, doesn't exist, which i.e., $\sim P$)

Assume $P \rightarrow Q$ (Q=he can do all things)... //

...implying

he cannot pick up a really big rock he made (limitation of omnipotence)

he cannot make a rock so huge that he could not pick up. (limitation of will or of endeavoring something that would violate his "omnipotence")

//Assuming $P \rightarrow Q$ is the atheist's tool to show certain impossibilities for God, hence to show $\sim Q$

Premise 1 $P \rightarrow Q$ //If God exists, then he could do all things. (re-use the canned premise)

Premise 2 Show $\sim Q$ is the case, //God CANNOT do all things & Plug $\sim Q$ back in as a premise

Conclusion: $\sim P$ //God does not exist.

***//Said another way:

1. If God exists (as you define him, omnipotent), then he can do any/everything—such as create an immovable rock.
2. But should God create the immovable rock, he cannot move it or either is inhibited from creating such an immovable rock.
3. Since God cannot create do any/everything, he (omnipotent, as you define him) cannot exist.

The problem is that we Christians define omnipotence as having all power, not being able to do absolutely any and everything—such as things that violate His own will or nature. For truly, the “God” who by virtue of his existence can then do absolutely anything does not exist...

Note: Premise ($P \rightarrow Q$) is a false premise, so the argument is not sound. God cannot stop existing, lie, sin, or do anything that violates His own nature/go against what He is naturally. So:

Resultant table proving the argument's validity.

P	Q	$\sim Q$	$P \rightarrow Q$	$\sim P$
T	T	F	T	F
T	F	T	F	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	T	T	T

Another similar example (from <http://online.missouri.edu/exec/data/courses/2349/public/lesson02/lesson02.aspx>) utilizing Modus Tollens is:

- P1. If God exists, then God is all-powerful, all-good, and all-knowing.
P2. If God were all-powerful, all-good, and all-knowing, then God would stop all evil.
P3. God has not stopped all evil.

C. Therefore, God does not exist.

Structure:

E = God exists.

A = God is all-powerful, all-good, and all-knowing.

S = God stops all evil.

P1. $E > A$

P2. $A > S$

P3. $\sim S$

C. $\sim E$

Resultant Truth Table for this argument: We see it to be valid, but the soundness is certainly in question.

	E	A	S	$E > A$	$A > S$	$\sim S$	$\sim E$
1.	t	t	t	t	t	f	f
2.	t	t	f	t	f	t	f
3.	t	f	t	f	t	f	f
4.	t	f	f	f	t	t	f
5.	f	t	t	t	t	f	t
6.	f	t	f	t	f	t	t
7.	f	f	t	t	t	f	t
8.	f	f	f	t	t	t	t*