

1) Aquinas presented three versions of the Cosmological Argument. The first is the way of motion. Aquinas pointed out that things in the world that moved, are moved by something else, which in turn was moved by something else, etc. He argued that infinite regress was impossible and therefore there must be a First Mover, itself unmoved, which set off the chain of events. Aquinas called this 'God'

The second way is that of causation. Aquinas observed that everything is an effect of a cause, and that those causes are effects of other causes and so on. Similar to the first way, Aquinas rejected the possibility of infinite regress and concluded that there must have been an Uncaused Cause; God.

The third of Aquinas' Cosmological arguments is the way of contingency. Aquinas argued

that everything in the world is contingent on something else. It is possible for everything to have not existed, therefore there must have been a time when nothing existed. There must ~~be~~ have been a being whose existence was necessary; if it would be impossible for it not to exist. This being is non-contingent, and Aquinas called it God.

Aquinas' cosmological arguments have many flaws and criticisms, however the most prominent is that it does not prove the existence of God. It argues towards an Unmoved Mover, and Uncaused Causer, and ~~an~~ Necessary Being, but there is no mention of ~~the~~ the traditional Theist God's defining attributes; love, power or presence. Aquinas' argument could point towards multiple gods, as opposed to the one God worshipped in Christianity, Judaism and Islam.

The god Aquinas proves could be malicious, creating the universe but enjoying (and possibly causing) evil and suffering.

There is no need for a Necessary Unmoved Mover or Uncaused Cause to be sentient or self aware. Aquinas' being could be a rock, or a turtle, or a child, or any number of things that do not subscribe to the Theist view of a personal, omnibenevolent, omnipresent, ~~omniscient~~ God.

Aquinas' arguments have convinced some people of a Deist standpoint. His arguments have their strengths (for example being a *a posteriori*-based off of conclusions drawn from observations and experiences), and seem to effectively prove the existence of a powerful being that began the universe. It does not, however, argue that that being is still here, controlling events and observing our lives. Instead, Aquinas could have proved the

existence of a God who has been likened to ~~the~~ someone winding up a watch - they created the universe and set things into motion, but then they left it to its own devices. This is a Deist God, who created the world but is no longer controlling nor observing it. They might be - as Nietzsche suggested - dead. This God is very different to the Theistic God - the one Aquinas, a monk, would have believed in.

However, one must consider the principle of Ockham's Razor. William of Ockham said that one should always assume the simplest solution as it is most likely to be true.

Aquinas' arguments may have ~~suggested~~ allowed the possibility of an army of cosmic turtle gods that created the universe ^{by accident} and then left to go swimming somewhere, but this seems overly complicated. And, to be frank, quite

ridiculous). The most simple solution by far, is that the world was created by a traditional Theist God.

In conclusion, Aquinas' three cosmological arguments point to an Unmoved Mover, an Uncaused Causer and a Necessary Being. None of these are necessarily the all-loving, all-knowing, all-powerful God that is described in Theistic scripture, however that seems to be the simplest solution and, according to William of Ockham; the one we should accept.

5.) Many people are against euthanasia for various reasons. They may say that killing is ~~bad~~ always wrong or that it goes against God's will. For many people, palliative care is their alternative to euthanasia, as it seeks to improve the quality of life near its end, as opposed to ending it prematurely.

However, there is some pain that palliative care simply cannot alleviate. There is a limit to what hospitals can do, and some people may spend the end of their life in so much pain that they still wish for a chance to end their life sooner.

Palliative care also does not convince some liberal Protestants, for example Joseph Fletcher. Fletcher argued that the 'sanctity of life' (a very common argument used against euthanasia) refers not only to the quantity of a life but also its quality. He said that keeping someone ^{who is suffering} alive against their wishes would be disregarding their sanctity of life, and would

therefore find it morally reprehensible.

One of the most prominent arguments against euthanasia by religious people, is that it goes against God. Only God gets to decide who lives and who dies. However, this only argues against active euthanasia - doing something that will actively end a life.

It could be argued that passive euthanasia - ~~stopped~~ withholding something that would keep someone alive - is more natural than prolonging a life using drugs and machines. It leaves even more up to God, as opposed to humans taking life and death into their own hands.

Overall, palliative care is not an effective solution to euthanasia.