

Cosmological argument for the existence of god essay

[Religion](#), [God](#)



In my view, God actually exists. I concur with the cosmological argument. The universe must be contingent. Human being has been so much curious to understand his existence and that of the world in general. The fact is that the world came into existence, it is contingent, and certain events and beings are casually contingent. The undoubted cause of these facts is the unmoved mover. There must have been a force behind all these, and this force is none other than the creator. In this discussion, my guiding factor is the existence of a contingent being, with an explanation for his existence. This explanation is not part of the contingent being.

There is need for casual explanation of the things in motion, those caused, and the contingent beings. This contingent being is most likely the universe. The link between the three is the unmoved mover who must have contributed to the prior cause. In real sense, if something exists, there must be a reason for the existence. There must also be a cause for the existence because something cannot cause its own existence.

However, we cannot just appreciate the fact that a contingent being existed first and this contingent being is the universe. This denies us the chance to explain its existence. It is quite difficult to develop the cause for the existence of the universe from just mere observations. "The universe is just there" (Russell, 1980). On the contrary, if the components of the universe are contingent, then, the universe itself is contingent. A false assumption is always made that "if a sample is good then the whole is good too". This contributes to the assumption that the universe and its contents are contingent. According to some people, the contingency of the universe and

its contents is a total fallacy. The argument is that, even if some possible world exists and a contingent being failed to exist in it, then, no possible such world would exist. This is linked to the horse race by Rowe, where a horse must be the winner (Rowe 1975). But this argument is also subjected to some conditions. What if all the horses break their legs? None would win.

For the contingency, there are still doubts that the existence of a contingent being necessitates the existence of the other. Just like the children and parents, the existence of a child shows that a parent existed. Based on the contingency of world's contents, a chance remains that a world without contingent beings exists. Also, Aquinas stipulates that if everything cannot be, then at some given time, nothing was in existence. This reasoning, in reverse direction, is true. At some given time, there would be nothing on the universe.

The explanation of something can be done in two ways. It can be explained as a whole or in parts. When the partial explanation is right, then without any doubt, a clue to the whole explanation is given. In other words, an explanation of why the parts exist or why they don't exist, give a strong clue on the cause for the existence or the failure for the existence. According to Rowe, when an existence of an element is explained by another element within the set, then it doesn't imply that the set has an explanation. This is because; every dependent being has an explanation of its existence, which may be quite different to why it is dependent (Rowe 1975). But, if the parts are on their own necessary beings, then the whole is explained. For necessary existence, the object must be casually independent. Let us cite

energy as an example. The necessary existence of energy is depicted by the failure for the creation of energy. The only thing that changes is the form of that energy. Matter has the same characteristic. Whatever change that matter goes through, its volume in the universe remains the same. In this case, several necessary being exist. All of these beings are internal to the universe. For Aquinas, necessary being exists. He asks whether these necessary beings owe their existence to themselves or to another superior being. If the existence is owed from another being, then there must be a being whose necessity is not caused. This uncaused necessity being must be God according to Aquinas.

In the traditional argument, the existence of all the relevant contingent condition (causal) must be explained. However, Swinburne stipulates that any attempt to go beyond the factors which we have easily results in no gain of prior probability (Swinburne, 1979). Instead, an explanation on why something exists and why it is the way it is makes it possible to explain the existence of the universe and God.

Certain individuals explain that the causal principle is suspect. However, these principles are very necessary so as to make the universe clearer. Several assumptions have been made so that science can find its base. Without such assumptions, it would be a hell on earth explaining the origin scientifically.

Finally, we can say that a necessary being exists. This is the conclusion of the cosmological argument, which I support to the latter. According to Kant,

there exists a being whose inexistence is beyond imagination (Kant, A606; Smart, in Haldane and Smart, 36-8). For this condition to be met there must be a maximally excellent being. This is the concept of the ontological argument. Having in mind that the ontological argument is defective, its dependents including the cosmological argument tend to be defective. This is however, an uncertainty. The necessary being discussed here-in has logically irrefutable. For proper explanation, this argument can be broken down into: The Kalām argument which stresses on the facts that everything that begins to exist has a cause of its existence; The Causal Principle and Quantum Physics; and the big bang theory among others.