

Candidate 3 evidence

Advanced Higher

Source 2 – Philosophy of Religion

4 (a)

The Kalam argument was created by two people in Arabic but then later modernised by William Lane Craig in the 1940s. The Kalam argument is a Cosmological argument and seeks to prove that God is the first uncaused cause of the universe. The Kalam argument is a posteriori argument as its evidence is based on knowledge after experience of their surroundings. The Kalam argument states that the God who caused the universe into existence is the God of classical theism. The Kalam argument states that when the universe began so did time itself therefore the God who caused them must exist outside of the universe and time and thus God is eternal.

4 (b)

The source states "Since everything that begins to exist" this means that everything has to have a beginning or a starting point and could not have just always existed it needs to have a beginning because infinite regress is impossible. The source also states that "has a cause of its existence" this means that everything that as ever existed or began must have been caused into existence by something else because it would be impossible for something to be the cause of itself. The source states "since the universe began to exist" this means that the universe must have had a beginning like everything else it could not just have existed because then the universe would be around for infinity but the cosmological argument does not agree with infinite regress so it would be impossible for the universe not to have a beginning. The source states "we conclude that therefore the universe has a cause of its existence" this means that the universe has it have a cause because like everything else it exists and had a beginning and something cannot have caused itself it had to begin due to something else therefore something caused the universe into existing we believe this to be God

4 (C)

"Since everything that begins to exist" I agree that everything that exists in this world had to have a starting point because if not then we would have been here forever and it is not possible for the universe to have been here forever because everything that comes into the world has a beginning) "has a cause of its existence" i agree with this point as i believe that everything has a cause of beginning and everything you do is caused by something else because you cannot have just began you would need to be caused into existence by someone else and it is physically impossible for something to just cause itself existence. Since the universe began to exist" I agree that the universe had to have a starting point because we have scientific evidence that suggests the universe is only so many years old how could it possibly be around forever if it didn't have a starting point. "We conclude that therefore the universe has a cause of its existence" I agree with this point as i believe that the universe must have come into existence somehow and could not have possibly already been here therefore it must have some into contact with something then started to begin and expand into the world we know it. However, i also disagree with this because the cosmological argument states that this cause is God but we do not have the sufficient knowledge in order to state that God truly caused the universe into existing it could have been so many other things such as a previous universe exploding or the big bang theory could be true there is no way to state that it had to be God.