

# Candidate 8 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<h3>Section 1</h3>	
<p>1. Thomas Aquinas' basic cosmological argument states that everything that exists has a cause. The universe exists so it must have a cause. The cause of the universe is God. God can be described as the uncaused cause of the cause. Aquinas' argument has three ways, causation, motion and contingency.</p>	
<p>The way of causation states that everything is caused by something before it. This cannot go on infinitely so there must be a first cause that causes everything else. The first cause is God as he is the only being powerful enough to be. A strength of this argument is that it can be backed up by scientific theories such as the theory of cause and effect. This states that every cause must have an effect. This means that God created the universe and the</p>	

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

effect was the universe coming into existence. This ~~also~~ makes the argument more reliable as it can be backed up and helps to show Aquinas has the most convincing argument. However, a weakness of this argument is that it doesn't prove the first cause is God, it only states it. It provides no actual proof of how Aquinas came to the conclusion that God is the first cause, it is an assumption. Another weakness is it creates the problem of needing a being powerful enough to create God and so on. It is also contradictory because if everything needs a cause, why doesn't God? Dawkins argues "the universe just is, that's all there is to say." This means that he believes the universe is just there, it wasn't created by God and we shouldn't question it's

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

existence. Despite its flaws Aquinas' cosmological argument is still the most convincing one as it makes sense and can be backed up.

The way of motion states that everything is moving and changing. However, there must be a first mover that sent everything else into motion. The first mover is God.

A strength of this argument is that it makes sense. We know everything is always moving and changing so it is logical to assume something must have put them in motion. As God is powerful enough to do this, it makes sense he is the first mover. However, a ~~concrete~~ weakness of this is it doesn't actually prove it was God. We know things may just move or change without something causing them to so it could be the same for

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

the universe. Another weakness is it could've been a different God from the Christian idea of God. It could've been multiple Gods or something different entirely such as the Big Bang. Although this way also has some flaws, Aquinas' cosmological argument is still the most convincing version as it adheres to things we already know and provides a clear explanation of ~~it~~ it, which is that God created the universe.

~~Aquinas~~ The way of contingency states that there must be something that brings contingent ~~things~~ things into existence. This being is God. A strength of this is it offers a clear explanation of how things come into existence. We know everything needs a cause and this shows how it is God that brings things

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

into existence.\* However, a weakness of this is things could come into existence themselves, who's to say they are dependent on God? However, this doesn't solve the issue of how things come into existence.

It still leaves the universe dependent on something because if it wasn't God who brought it into existence, who or what did? Again, despite its flaws Aquinas' cosmological argument is still the most convincing because it provides a clear explanation and supports what we ~~already~~ already believe, which is everything must be created/brought into existence by something else. ☺ ☺

\* Aquinas states "something created the universe, it's goodness and all other perfections. This being is God" This shows how Aquinas believed that God created the universe perfectly as he is also perfect. It

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

supports his belief that God brings everything into existence.

A counter argument to ~~this~~ Aquinas' cosmological argument is the Big Bang Theory. This states that the universe began over 13 billion years ago from a point of singularity. It was an expansion, not an explosion and the universe continues to expand today. A strength of this is it provides a non religious explanation to the creation of the universe and has proof to back it up. For example, the Red Shift Theory looks at light in the universe and as the light is on the red side of the scale, it is furthest away from us. ~~This shows~~ This shows the universe is expanding and therefore backs up the Big Bang Theory. However, a weakness of this is it only

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

provides proof up to 300,000 years ago. After that ~~now~~ it is unclear. A 'point of singularity' is used to describe it because our knowledge of physics breaks down. This makes the theory unreliable if it cannot go further back because we have no more knowledge.

Kant argues that we cannot make conclusions on the creation of the universe because we haven't experienced it. This means he doesn't support either argument for the creation of the universe because they are trying to explain something no one has experienced. However, it is possible the arguments could work together.

For example, God could've put the Big Bang into motion and ~~therefore~~ therefore he still created the universe, just not in the way many traditional Christians believe he did.

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

In conclusion, Aquinas' argument is the most convincing Cosmological argument. Although it has flaws and some convincing counter arguments, it is the strongest cosmological argument. It goes along with things many already believe and provides proof to back up its claims. It is also a clear and understandable argument. Therefore, Aquinas' argument is the most convincing cosmological argument.