Philosophy of Religion WJEC AS Knowledge Organiser: Theme 1A Inductive arguments: Cosmological



Key concepts

- Inductive reasoning is a posteriori (post experience), depending on empirical evidence to reach a possible and most probable conclusion.
- The cosmological argument uses the evidence of the existing and contingent universe as the basis for its argument in suggesting an origin – a first cause.
- Aquinas presented three arguments based upon motion (change), causes and contingent existence. All motions, causes and contingencies necessitate a first cause that is unmoved, uncaused and necessary.
- First way: motion. An object has
 the potential to become something
 different; it is motion, or change, that
 transforms potential into something
 else. Potential and actual are two
 different states of being and it is the
 actual state of another entity that moves
 the potential in one thing towards its
 own actual state. There is a constant
 state of movement in the world but an
 infinite regress would mean no first
 mover and therefore no movement now
 which is illogical. There must be a First
 Mover; this is what we call God.

- Second way: cause. Nothing that exists could be self-caused (by being in both actual and potential states simultaneously) since this would mean that existed in order to bring itself into existence; this is illogical. An infinite regress of causes would mean no First Cause and hence no causes now. There must be a First Cause; this is what we call God.
- Third way: contingency. Contingent (temporary) beings have the possibility of not existing. This means that at one time there must have been no beings in existence. Nothing cannot bring something into existence; therefore, there must be an original being that is noncontingent; this necessary being is God.
- The Kalam argument is an ancient Arabic argument based similarly on the notion of a First Cause. William Lane Craig developed the Kalam argument.
- has a cause for its existence that is both temporal and temporary. The universe began to exist and no scientific explanation can provide a causal account for this since an actual infinite is not possible. Therefore, there must be a different understanding of the universe as potentially infinite to which temporal events can be added. This notion of a potentially infinite universe necessitates a First Cause which is best explained by the notion of a personal being such as God.

Key words

AQUINAS

INDUCTIVE

A POSTERIORI

EMPIRICAL

FIRST CAUSE

CONTINGENT

INFINITE REGRESS

POTENTIAL

ACTUAL

NECESSARY

KALAM

WILLIAM CRAIG

TEMPORAL

TEMPORARY

CAUSAL

ACTUAL INFINITE

POTENTIAL INFINITE

PERSONAL AGENT

Key quotes

'... nothing can be reduced from potentiality to actuality, except by something in a state of actuality.' (Thomas Aquinas)

'There is no case known... in which a thing is found to be the efficient cause of itself.' (Thomas Aquinas)

'I think that it can be plausibly argued that the cause of the universe must be a personal Creator. For how else could a temporal effect arise from an eternal cause?'
(William Lane Craig)

'Empiricists claim that sense experience is the ultimate source of all our concepts and knowledge.' (John L. Mackie)

'The only way to have an eternal cause but a temporal effect would seem to be if the cause is a personal agent who freely chooses to create an effect in time.' (William Lane Craig)

Issues for analysis and evaluation

Key arguments/debates

Some philosophers see this as a scientifically sound and evidence-based argument. It is verified by other supporting arguments also (cumulative).

Others would argue that the conclusion is flawed; it is only one possibility by nature of it being inductive. It becomes a groundless explanation.

Some would argue that an infinite regress is possible without a first cause and that Craig's notion of a personal agent is a false dichotemy.

Key questions

Can an inductive argument be strong enough for proof?

Are the challenges enough to destroy the cosmological?

Is a First cause a credible conclusion?

Are there any alternative explanations or conclusions to be drawn from the debate?