

## Candidate 2 evidence

Advanced Higher

Source 1 – Philosophy of Religion

4 (a)

The Kalam Cosmological argument was proposed by Al-Ghazali and later popularised by William Lane Craig. The argument states that everything which begins to exist has a cause for its beginning & since the universe is a being which began, it also must possess a cause for its existence. The Kalam Cosmological argument seeks to prove the existence of God by stating that the universe must have been caused by something necessary which itself is uncaused. Because the Kalam argument is a cosmological argument it uses inductive reasoning, meaning it proposes premises which logically lead to a conclusion. Because it is inductive, it can never guarantee to have a true conclusion.

4 (b)

Craig states 'everything that begins to exist has a cause for its existence' we can see that this is true as everything in the world began, for example, human beings are born, we are not infinite. The quote says 'the universe began to exist' – this is likely true as the universe can't be infinite, this is because if it was, it would have run out of energy by this point. However, there is also the possibility that infinity is possible, but it is just such a complex concept that we cannot understand it. David Hilbert's hotel analogy shows this, as it itself is complicated and hard to follow. Craig states 'the universe has a cause for its existence' – this is only logically true if infinity really is impossible which we cannot easily establish. However, if infinity was impossible, the universe would logically have to have been caused by something else.

4 (c)

On the one hand, Craig has a strong argument. For example, it is true that everything has a cause. However, it could also be argued that there may be things beyond our knowledge that do not have a cause, for example, the universe may be beyond our understanding, therefore we cannot be certain if it has a cause or not. However, it is more likely that since everything in the world we are aware of seems to have a cause, the universe likely does too. Apart from the question of whether everything, including the universe, does actually have a cause is logical. However, the main part of the argument states that everything does have a cause, which is what his argument relies on and since this itself is shaky his argument as a whole is weak.