

| ENTER<br>NUMBER<br>OF<br>QUESTION | Sect 1 philosophy of religion.  | DI<br>WI<br>M |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------|
|                                   |   |               |
| ①                                 | <p>The cosmological argument was developed by St. Thomas Aquinas after Aristotle said "everything that is moved is caused to by something else".</p> <p>The argument is an a posteriori proof of the existence of a first cause, which Aquinas believed as gods. This means it is based on previous experiences. The cosmological arguments come from Aquinas' book "Summa Theologica".</p> |               |
|                                   | <p>Aquinas had three ways of proving the existence of a necessary being. firstly, cause: premise one states that everything depends upon something before it for its existence. premise two says that there must therefore be a chain of cause and effect stretching back through time, however, the chain</p>  |               |

can't be infinite or be material present day world never arrive. Finally, arriving at the conclusion that there must be a first uncaused cause. Secondly, the argument from motion follows a similar pattern: everything that moves has been caused to by something else, there must be a chain of motion stretching back throughout time, however the chain can't be infinite so there must be a prime, first mover, "this all men know of as God". Aquinas. The third way is from contingency. Aquinas says that everything that exists exists contingently (comes in and out of existence), so if we go back in time far enough, there must have been a time where nothing existed. As Parmenides said "ex nihilo nihil fit" - from nothing, nothing can come, this means

that the universe must have had a first cause, that is uncaused.

The cosmological argument has come under heavy criticism since then from philosophers such as David Hume, Bertrand Russell and Immanuel Kant.

Bertrand Russell first criticized the argument in the famous 1947 radio debate with F. C. Copleston. Copleston argued on Aquinas' side saying that there is surely an explanation for the complex universe that we live in. Russell responded strongly, firstly saying that 'we' want to believe the universe has a cause because we like to be thought of as important and we want a reason to be on the earth. Russell also ~~says~~ questions the



The next criticism is from causation and from David Hume. Hume ~~is~~ says the argument is weak ~~as~~ and can never be ~~proved~~ used as absolute proof because it is a posteriori and therefore only based on experience. This is said to be "Hume's killing blow".

Criticizing the logic may seem a strong criticism from Hume. Hume ~~criticized~~ says Aquinas can't say everything must have a cause and there is a chain of cause and effect because he can't predict the future with absolute certainty. Aquinas makes a synthetic statement which is not strictly the according to Hume. However this criticism also seems harsh as no-one will ever be able to predict the future exactly but Aquinas has used an example of

Strong inductive logic here. It is very likely that the sun will rise tomorrow as it has risen everyday so far in the history of the world. The argument is self contradictory, premise one and the conclusion contradict, if everything has a cause, what caused god?

Thirdly, it is when Hume says Aquinas commits the fallacy of the composition. This is a criticism of the argument from contingency. Aquinas says everything in the universe is contingent, so the universe itself must be contingent. Hume takes issue with this, saying that nothing can be explained as a whole by its component parts. An example Hume gives is that "every human has a mother", therefore the human race must also have a mother". However this is obviously not true. As humans we want to believe a supernatural

Another criticism is the concept of a necessary being. This is when Immanuel Kant says that

explanation to the world universe, as it satisfies our mind, to believe in a supernatural explanation like god, is simply "an arbitrary act of the mind"

Another criticism is the concept of a necessary being. This is when Kant criticizes Aquinas' conclusion of saying that god is the first cause. He says that even if the logic is sound and the premises are correct, there is no reason to believe it is god that has created the universe. He says "why the christian god?" God is not logically necessary for the existence of the universe, the universe may be

| QUESTION   | M |
|--|---|
| <p>"a brute fact".</p> <p>In more recent times, the cosmological argument has come under <del>scrutiny</del> <del>scrutiny</del> from science. <del>God is not</del> <del>logically necessary for the existence of the universe.</del></p>   |   |
| <p>firmly, oscillating universe theory (OUD) says that it is perfectly possible that the universe has been in a constant <sup>repeating</sup> process of contraction, expansion, explosion and that infinite regress is perfectly possible. Natural explanation with no need for god.</p>                    |   |
| <p>Another scientific theory that poses a challenge to the cosmological argument is quantum theory. Quantum theory says that it is possible that something can come from nothing. This would challenge the fine tune argument and the theory also provides a natural explanation of the universe with no</p> |   |



need for god.

On the other hand, science can also provide weight to Aquinas' argument.

The Big Bang Theory (BBT) happened approximately 13.9 billion years ago

when there was huge explosion in which helium and hydrogen

particles with zero mass but infinite density blew up, cooled and formed

the universe. This theory points to a

beginning, which is consistent with

Aquinas' first cause argument.  
BBT may be god's creation mechanism.

Centuries ago, mathematician, Ludwig

Wittgenstein ~~se~~ rendered challenges

from science to the cosmological

argument worthless as science and

religion speak different languages

(language games). Science says how

we came into existence, religion says why we came into existence.

In conclusion, "Humes Killing Blow" criticising Aquinas' use of inductive logic will never be able to be overturned as ~~it is~~ Aquinas' argument can never be used as undoubted proof, but Aquinas<sup>#</sup> didn't have that aim, "rather to render doubt unreasonable".

I believe that Kant's criticism of asking "why gods?" is strong as there is no reason whatsoever to suggest god is the uncaused cause but I don't believe philosophic or scientific criticism is strong enough to dismissing a first cause, so although Aquinas may not have given us ~~absolute proof~~<sup>#</sup> 'absolute proof' of a first cause, he has certainly come close.

| ENTER<br>NUMBER<br>OF<br>QUESTION | Part B - medical ethics  | DO NOT<br>WRITE<br>THE<br>MARK |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
|                                   |  |                                |
| 6                                 | <p>Euthanasia is considered 'good death' and is illegal in the UK under the 1961 suicide act. If found guilty of assisted suicide, one may be found guilty of manslaughter. In Scotland it is considered as culpable homicide. There are 5 types of euthanasia:</p> <p>Active: ending patients life through medical intervention. Passive: ending patients life by withdrawing treatment. Voluntary: ending life <sup>at</sup> a patients request. Involuntary: ending life against a patients wishes. Non-voluntary - ending a patients life when they cant give consent.</p> |                                |
|                                   | <p>Many people have issue with the current law on euthanasia saying it is morally wrong to prolong agony and pain. Some</p>  |                                |

Say that the current UK law on euthanasia is state torture and could be considered a criminal offence. However the government would argue that ending someone's life is effectively killing which can never be permitted.

Another ~~moral~~ issue with the current law to say euthanasia is a moral act is that everyone should be in control of their life. "I am the master of my ship, I am the captain of my boat". Everyone should have the right to life and have dignity in dying should they want it. However, a counter-argument is that palliative care provides a dignified enjoyable end to life.

Permitting euthanasia would be morally unacceptable as it suggests that life is cheap and disposable.

Utilitarians believe "an action is right if it produces the greatest happiness for the greatest number" - Jeremy Bentham. Utilitarians would see euthanasia as morally acceptable as the patient is happy they get their wish and although it may sound strange, the patient's family will be happy their relative has got their wish and is no longer suffering.

Libertarians will view euthanasia as morally acceptable as ~~they~~ their principles are that everyone should be able to live life the way they want to, so it

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | part B medical ethics  | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 6                        | <p>a patients wants to die it is morally wrong to deny them that.</p>  |                             |
|                          | <p><del>transmission</del> Kantian ethics belongs to the <del>deontological</del> deontological branch of ethics and is all about the intentions. Immanuel Kant had two tests to determine if an act is right or wrong: universal and ends in themselves. Euthanasia fails the universal law test as if it was adopted around the world, everyone would be dead. It also fails the ends in themselves test by using the patient as a means to an end so Kant would say euthanasia is morally unacceptable.</p> |                             |
|                          | <p>many<br/>↓<br/>Christians are against euthanasia as it goes against many of the</p>   |                             |

teachings from the bible. "do not kill"  
this is so simple to understand and it  
Jesus' greatest commandment so  
helping one die goes against the bible's  
teachings.

Christians also believe we are created  
in the "image of god" so euthanasia  
and helping someone die is ~~a~~ similar to  
helping harm god which is obviously  
~~not~~ strictly unacceptable.

Christians believe "god gives and god  
takes away" so we shouldn't play  
god and help end one's life. The patient  
will die when god sees fit, we should  
not intervene, euthanasia is morally  
unacceptable.

Pope John Paul II of the Catholic Church said "life is sacred" so we should always persevere and never quit so euthanasia is morally wrong.

However, God gave us a free will and we all have a sense of morality so when considering life and death decisions, God ~~says~~ says we can die if we want to so euthanasia is morally acceptable.

Jesus taught "love your neighbor". If a patient wishes to die, then assisting them is seen as a loving act that is viewed as morally acceptable by Christians.



| ENTER<br>NUMBER<br>OF<br>QUESTION | PART B - medical ethics.   |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 6                                 | <p>Jesus also taught "treat others as you would like to be treated". When <sup>if</sup> <sup>is right or wrong</sup> considering <del>extremism</del> <sup>extremism</sup>, <del>the</del> <sup>some</sup> Christians must empathize with the patients and wonder what they would do if they were in the same position. They would want <del>extremism</del> <sup>extremism</sup>, so alot of Christians consider <del>extremism</del> <sup>extremism</sup> morally acceptable.</p> <p>In conclusion, <del>extremism</del> <sup>extremism</sup> is not morally unacceptable. There is no concern with having an option open.</p> <p>On the other hand, forcing patients to live through life-shattering, excruciating pain is morally unacceptable. It is morally justifiable to let each person be in control of their life and have dignity in dying. No-one should ever be tortured and prolongation of pain is exactly</p> |

| IN   | MA |
|--|----|
| <p>that. Even though extracts of the bible<br/><del>say</del> hint that euthanasia is wrong, it<br/>also makes exceptions to the rule as they<br/>can see it is wrong to extend a persons<br/>life where living is painful and uncomfortable</p> |    |