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God’s Existence in the Cosmological Argument

The cosmological argument is a posteriori argument that strives to prove the existence of God. It is an argument that uses external observations and experiences in order to prove its conclusion. It looks at the functionality of our universe, causation and order, as these are the things that we experience in the universe and by the principles of essentialism, and these have to come from somewhere.

The argument primarily reaches the conclusion that these things come from God and there are many advocates of the cosmological argument, beginning from Plato and Aristotle, but significant developments for its understanding started to arise in the thirteenth century during the times of Thomas Aquinas and Samuel Clarke. The argument has two parts which are distinct from each other. It is an inductive argument which leads to drawing of a conclusion and it can only persuade its followers about the reasonable nature of its conclusion. According to William Rowe, this argument wants us to accept that the cause of universe is what we associate with a higher deity or God. Putting it another way, it deconstructs the premise that why is there a universe at all. Based on the law of cause and effect, the primary cause can be traced back to the scientifically approved Big Bang Theory. If the idea of infinite regress is rejected, which asserts that the universe has always existed, and if there is a possibility that this chain of events cannot go on forever, then there must be a first cause. Rowe further maintains that if that first cause in not part of this universe, then it not bound by time or the physical properties of matter and energy.

Something which is not physical, is not bound by time, and is not caused can be considered as spiritual, eternal, and necessary respectively. A being which is spiritual, necessary and eternal, and is the cause for creating this universe is called as God by many people. Thus, according to the cosmological argument, the first cause is God.

**Two objections to the argument**

The advocate of the argument treats the vast collection of all the dependent beings and their chain as though it itself is an independent being an in this process, there is a requirement of a sound explanation of its existence. But the process of objection continues to go on, that the collection of dependent beings is itself a dependent being in the true essence.

The proponent also infers deductively that if all the members of the group of dependent beings have a cause of their existence, then the collection of those dependent beings must also be having a cause. This is also a criticism to the argument but in the notes of Bertrand Russell, this inference is prone to a high chance of fallacy as it mirrors with the analogy that if all the members of human race which in this case is the collection of human beings have a mother, then the human race must also have a mother. This fallacy can lead the argument towards a contradiction among its premises.

Even though the cosmological argument faces heavy critique, it also presents us with a large variety of various points and as reconstructed by William Rowe, succeeds in proving the existence of God. The logical progression as presented by the argument does not seem irrational because it provides the followers with an opportunistic perspective of the creation of universe.

Although Big Bang contradicts the cosmological argument according to the reconstruction of this essay, both agree that the universe has a definite starting point.
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