Three views universe







On this view, everything which begins to exist at some time must have a cause. Because the universe — including the Big Bang — has a beginning in time, the universe as a whole — again, including the Big Bang — must have a cause. So the Big Bang can't be the first cause and indeed nothing in the universe can be.

If one accepts this extra premise, and one accepts the assumption that the universe came to exist at some time, then it follows that the universe was caused to exist by something outside the universe.

And then there are just two options — that thing must be eternal, or it must have come to exist at a certain time.

If we go with the second option, then it must have had a cause. And then that thing would have to be eternal, or have come to exist a certain time.

There are a number of questions one could raise about this argument. But let's focus in on one premise:

12. If there is an eternally existing first cause of the universe and everything in it, then God exists.

Could one object to this premise in much the way that we objected to Aguinas' assumption that if there is a first cause, then that thing must be God? How do we know that this eternally existing first cause of the universe is God?

This is a reasonable question. Here is one way which a defender of the kalām argument might respond.

Most theists are less certain that God exists than they are that 2+2=4; most atheists are less certain than God does not exist than they are that 2+2=4. So most of us think that there is some chance that God exists and some chance that God does not exist.

Keeping this in mind, recall the three hypotheses about reality with which we began.

Simple theism God exists, and

God exists, and created the universe.

Simple atheism

The universe (or perhaps several universes) are all that exists. Nothing created it (or them).

Quasi-the<u>ism</u>

The universe was created by something outside of it, but not by God.

If you agree that the kalām argument shows that that there is a beginningless being outside of the universe which caused the universe to exist, that rules out simple atheism. So the simple atheist cannot respond to the argument just by denying (12).

Does the existence of such a being rule out quasi-theism? No. So it looks like the kalām argument should not convince at least some kinds of quasi-theists that God exists.


50%

SIMPLE THEISM

SIMPLE ATHEISM



Suppose now that you are convinced that every premise of the kalām argument besides (10) is true. So you are convinced that there is a beginningless first cause of the universe -- and just not sure whether that thing is God.





This rules out simple atheism. So (in this simplified example) the probability you assign to simple atheism goes down to 0%.











cause. Because the universe — including the Big Bang — has a

and indeed nothing in the universe can be.

Bang — must have a cause. So the Big Bang can't be the first cause —

beginning in time, the universe as a whole — again, including the Big

On this view, everything which begins to exist at some time must have a

the universe came to exist at some time, then it follows that the universe

If one accepts this extra premise, and one accepts the assumption that

was caused to exist by something outside the universe.

must have come to exist at a certain time.

And then there are just two options — that thing must be eternal, or it

If we go with the second option, then it must have had a cause. And

then that thing would have to be eternal, or have come to exist a certain

There are a number of questions one could raise about this argument.

But let's focus in on one premise:



universe and everything in it, then God exists.

12. If there is an eternally existing first cause of the

Could one object to this premise in much the way that we objected to

Aquinas' assumption that if there is a first cause, then that thing must

be God? How do we know that this eternally existing first cause of the

universe is God?

This is a reasonable question. Here is one way which a defender of the

kalām argument might respond.

and some chance that God does not exist.

Most theists are less certain that God exists than they are that 2+2=4;

2+2=4. So most of us think that there is some chance that God exists

most atheists are less certain than God does not exist than they are that

Keeping this in mind, recall the three hypotheses about reality with

which we began.

If you agree that the kalām argument shows that that there is a

beginningless being outside of the universe which caused the universe to


exist, that rules out simple atheism. So the simple atheist cannot

respond to the argument just by denying (12).

Does the existence of such a being rule out quasi-theism? No. So it

looks like the kalām argument should not convince at least some kinds of

quasi-theists that God exists.











Suppose now that you are convinced that every premise of the kalām

argument besides (10) is true. So you are convinced that there is a

thing is God.

beginningless first cause of the universe -- and just not sure whether that





This rules out simple atheism. So (in this simplified example) the

probability you assign to simple atheism goes down to 0%.







grounds that there can't be an uncaused cause, like the explosion of

particles described?

Might one defend (8) by saying that this hypothesis is impossible, on the



first cause, then

God exists.

8. If there is a

have a cause; but things like God don't.

Instead, it seems like Aquinas has to argue that nothing like the Big

Bang could genuinely be a first cause. Things like the Big Bang have to

which was an uncaused cause would have to have other properties, which

God has, but the Big Bang does not.

he did not have the Big Bang in mind). He tried to argue that something

And that is, in a way, exactly what Aquinas tried to do (though of course

grounds that there can't be an uncaused cause?

Might one defend (8) by saying that this hypothesis is impossible, on the

Bang have to have a cause; but things like God don't. But why?

Instead, it seems like a defender of the first cause argument has to argue that

nothing like the Big Bang could genuinely be a first cause. Things like the Big

This would appear to be a description of a world in which there is a first

some reason for rejecting the above hypothesis.

cause, but God does not exist. And it appears to be entirely consistent with

simple atheism. So it looks as though, if we are to believe (8), we must have

The Big Bang

The first event in the history of the universe was an explosion of an extremely dense collection of particles, with every particle moving apart from every other particle. This event had no cause - in particular, no being set it into motion - and, further, every subsequent event has been an effect of this event.

Many arguments for God's existence are best thought of as

we will return.

good arguments for the existence of God then depends in part on

arguments against simple atheism. Whether they also amount to

how seriously you take quasi-theism. This is something to which

Let's turn then to our first argument for the existence of God: the

first cause argument we find in the reading from Thomas Aquinas.







Our first topic is the question of whether God exists.













1. If something were the cause

chains. causal

itself.

2. Nothing is prior to itself.

7. There is a first cause.

cause.

5. At least one thing has a

(1,2)itself.

3. Nothing is the cause of

of itself, it would be prior

4. There are no infinite

or (iii) have a first cause.

6. Every causal chain must be

8. If there is a first cause,

then God exists.

(i) circular, (ii) infinite, ______

(3,4,5,6)

(7,8)C. God exists.













SIMPLE ATHEISM







10%

