

↳	The Cosmological Argument, is an a posteriori argument that <del>at</del> attempts to prove the existence of God by using the evidence of Cause and Effect. The argument often cites our experience of everything in the universe having a cause, ourselves machinery etc. and then argues it would be a logical impossibility to claim that the universe, such a complex and unique item could have come about by chance.	
	∴ However many agree that all the argument does is prove that the universe had a starting point, a "first cause": and it does not necessarily convince all that the first cause was God.	

The most famous cosmological argument was put forward by the 13<sup>th</sup> Century philosopher St. Thomas Aquinas, in his publication "Summa Theologica". He put forward 5 ways as a means of proving God as the creator of the universe. The three main ones are, firstly, everything that is in motion has been put there by something. All things that are in motion have a cause for their being in that state. ~~the~~ Due to our experience of this, the universe itself must therefore have a cause outside itself for its existence and this cause must be God. ~~The~~ ~~so~~ while this makes logical sense the conclusion drawn from these premises does ~~it~~ seem to be very

Weak. Whilst there may be a first cause,	
St Thomas gives no reason or evidence	
as to why it must be God.	
The second way is to do with	
sufficient reason. Nothing can exist	
prior to itself therefore nothing can	
<hr/>	
* These chains could go back forever,	
however this would seem irrational due	
to our experiences of the world	
and infinity. Therefore there must be a	
first cause and namely that must	
be God.	
<hr/>	
be the sufficient cause of itself.	
Therefore the universe must have a	
sufficient cause for its existence, and	
we only know sufficient cause for	

<p>         This is God. However in relation to          the question then St. Thomas <del>also</del> makes          an error in reasoning, while <del>arguing</del> it          does seem to give the idea that          there is a first cause, his reasoning          should imply that God must have a          cause as he is a being and, based          on our experience, cannot exist prior to          itself. <del>Therefore</del> his <del>is</del> evidence of proving God          can be regarded <del>as</del> <del>such</del>.          St. Thomas arguments here,          while with valid <del>and</del> premises that are          looking us into his conclusion, will only          help to reaffirm belief in those that          have faith in such evidence already.          It will not likely convince non-believers          as St. Thomas provides no tangible evidence          for God, but rather an interpretation.       </p>
---

eg the facts that could lead me to say that there was a first cause to the universe but not necessarily a God. Finally St Thomas talks in his 3<sup>rd</sup> way about necessary and contingent beings. a contingent being is one that relies on something for its existence. Necessary beings are ones that do not rely on something else for their existence and can be the cause of themselves. St Thomas claims God to be a necessary being and so lives outside our realm of experience and normality. This part I feel would prove existence of God if St Thomas had any real evidence pointing towards this statement.

However this is really a common statement made by St Thomas in an attempt to get out of the school by phallacy, what created God.

Another cosmological argument that perhaps gave God not just a first cause that is that of the Kalam cosmological argument. First put forward by Muslim philosophers, but more recently developed by Professor William Lane Craig, the argument goes as follows,

~~1) Everything in the universe is in existence because something~~

1) Everything that is in existence has a beginning to its existence.

2) The universe is in existence therefore the universe must have a beginning.

5) If the universe has a beginning then this beginning must be God.

Conc. God exists.

However this argument again commits the fallacy of making a jump, without valid evidence of saying that

& the universe has a first cause, then that cause must be God.

Also with recent developments in modern science we can see that not everything has a beginning to its existence. Quantum mechanics show us that there are particles that seem to pop-in and disappear from existence at random.

Therefore maybe the first cause was a random burst of particles, and not a creator God.

	<p> <del>It</del> Also many claim st Thomas has a            medieval world view. The idea that            something cannot come from nothing            is no longer held. However there            is an agreement still that the            universe does have a first cause.            Scientists believe that it is the Big            Bang, and the majority of people believe            that too say also. This affirms            the idea that st Thomas proved            the existence of a first cause but            not God.         </p>
	<p>           The most famous attack on            the cosmological argument came from  <del>the</del> the 17<sup>th</sup> century philosopher David            Hume, in his book "Dialogues            concerning Natural Religion." <del>was</del> In this         </p>



	David Hume argues the point that
	<del>just</del> because we can imagine
	the universe existing, so to can
	we imagine it not existing.
	At one point Hume even accepts
	the idea put forward by Aquinas
	that there is a trial but, of
	course, states that it may not be
	the God of the traditional Judeo-
	Christian tradition, it could be an
	evil, uncaring God who created the
	universe and is more than happy to
	watch us suffer within it.
	Hume's ideas are backed up
	by the 20th Century philosopher
	Bertrand Russell who says that just
	because we can see things within the

	Universe having a cause <del>it</del> does not	
	mean that the universe itself has	
	a cause. He gives the illustration	
	by saying the following: Even though	
	everyone in the world has a mother	
	does not mean the universe itself has	
	a mother. <del>It's</del> Russell's views are very	
	much scorned up by the his statement	
	"The universe exists and that all that	
	is to say on the matter of	
	cause it is far more reasonable	
	to question how can we get here	
	and who made it rather than	
	simply ignoring the whole situation"	
	<del>It</del>	
	He asks why the universe cannot	
	go on for infinity. There is	

		No reason to suggest that it cannot
		offer that our experience and st
		Thomas claims that God lives
		without our parameters of experience.
		Also Hume makes the point that if
		you can say that God is infinite
		so to you could put those characteristics
		on the universe and take out the
		middle man of the creator God.
		This would very much fall into
		the idea of Occam's Razor, the
		simplest suggestion being the most
		likely. <u>There could have been a finite number of particles that with right conditions could</u>
		<u>have brought about the universe.</u>
		Gottfried Leibniz also put forth the
		idea of sufficient reason. He made
		the point that nothing can exist
		prior to itself and so therefore nothing

Can be the sufficient cause of itself →  
 This again seems to build up the idea  
 of a good cause rather than a  
 bad.

Finally Paul Davies, a scientist, put  
 forward the Grand unifying theory or  
 The Theory of everything. This theory  
 proposes the idea that everything  
 in the universe was put  
 there.

In conclusion, while St. Thomas' Argument makes a good valid case for there being a cause to the universe it isn't successful in proving God as there are alternate explanations such as the Big Bang Theory or the idea

g Quantum mechanics that suggest they were the first cause.

6- Euthanasia, originating from Greek meaning Good Death, is the term ~~used~~ given to the ending of a life of a terminally ill patient. There is much moral controversy over this issue with a range of thinkers and Religions disagreeing in their views of its moral use.

The Roman Catholic Church is perhaps the most vocal religion on this issue and as such there are a clash of different view points upon this topic. Generally it is felt that this action is wrong as life is believed

to be a gift from God and as  
 such only he should have the  
 right to take it away. Advocates  
 also of his belief from texts  
 the bible to show evidence for  
 this position. The most obvious  
 of which comes from the  
 10 commandments "Thou shalt not  
 kill." The church preaches that  
 euthanasia is tantamount to murder  
 and as such is <sup>a sin,</sup> morally wrong  
 and goes against God. Pope  
 John Paul II said euthanasia  
 to be a "grave violation of  
 the law of God." in his  
 Evangelium Vitae. However ~~others~~  
 Christians believe euthanasia ~~is~~ to  
 be morally permissible if it is

done to end the suffering of  
 a person. Some say that the  
 pain a suffering brought about  
 by a terminal illness involves  
 human life and so ending  
 it is the most humane thing  
 to do. They also claim that  
 since God has given free  
 will to the people then it  
 should be a right to allow  
 ones self to die. It is also  
 perhaps the most moral thing to  
 do as it gives the people their  
 right to die. However as  
 President Eisenhower once said, "a  
 society that hold its ~~right~~ principles  
 above its principles will lose both."  
 If we don't have a clear

moral line that states we should  
 attempt save human life no matter  
 what the cost it could lead to a  
 slippery slope where human life is  
 devalued

Utilitarianism, in first order moral philosophy,  
 also has roots upon euthanasia.  
 We believe in the greatest happiness  
 principle, and say that one should  
 seek to achieve or making  
 "the greatest amount of good for  
 the greatest number of people." when  
 making a moral decision. As such  
 we it would seem that it is  
 easy to see if they are for or  
 against. In Britain over 60% of  
 people wish to see euthanasia



legalised and as such then it would  
 seem that utilitarians would be pro-  
 choice. However while many wish it  
 to be legalised, when they are  
 in the position where a loved one  
 is requesting it then, upset, angry and  
 other emotions kick in at the thought  
 of a hastened death of that person  
 and so a wish to see euthanasia  
 being outlawed is arisen.

~~There~~  
 This part of the situation of  
 a devaluation of human life and  
 premature ending of a life for someone  
 with a life changing illness is also  
 one the Baroness Campbell uses to discourage  
 any attempt at legalising euthanasia.  
 She believes that it is cruel.



~~That~~ That help is provided by the state, not euthanasia.

In conclusion, the ~~is~~ moral question raised by euthanasia, is human life devalued by it. Is it ever ~~right~~ permissible to help a human life are strongly debated by all those that argue the issue. I feel that euthanasia should be legalised as in a democracy we should have the right to end their life if they feel ~~that~~ that there their suffering is simply too great. Of course the concerns raised by those against are perfectly valid and as such there should be ~~the~~ solid guidelines in place from which ~~no~~ deviation is permissible.