

## **Discussion of the validity of the Cosmological argument and Russell's arguments against it.**

*Bertrand Russell argues against both of the Cosmological arguments put forward by Aquinas and Copleston. The first (the argument of the first cause), states that the universe is a series of causes going back to a first cause (God). The argument begins by saying that everything has a cause. This contradicts the argument straight away, because God is supposedly something that does not have a cause. So the first step is that everything except God has a cause. Bertrand Russell argues that, if something like God can exist without a cause, then why must the Universe necessarily have a cause.*

*I agree here with Bertrand Russell that, to me, it is as conceivable that the Universe has no cause, as it is that there is a being outside of our Universe that has no cause. However, Russell is then suggesting one of two things, either: The Universe had a beginning at which point it came from nothing and it has no cause at all, or: The Universe has no beginning. It stretches infinitely far back in time, and we are merely at one event of an infinite amount of events. The first point suggests that something came from nothing at some point, which seems like an impossibility. The second possibility suggests that time is infinite, and, as Aristotle argued, if there was an infinite amount of time before the present, then we would never reach the present.*

*Although the two alternatives to the first Cosmological arguments have faults, I find them as conceivable as the possibility of an entity that exists outside of existence that began Universe and existence itself.*

*Bertrand Russell's argument against Copleston's view on the Cosmological argument was put forward in the live 1948 Radio 4 debate between the two. However, the argument goes on until the two fundamental views of each person become apparent. One of the*

*first steps in Copleston's argument is that the Universe must definitely have a cause that exists outside of itself. However, Russell's view is that there is no conceivable reason why we should question the reason (or cause) for the Universe's existence. They did not argue on this point, except that Russell claimed that some things in the world exist without a cause, and Copleston claimed that everything has a cause. Once their views on this matter were made apparent, the argument cannot continue,*

*Although I support Russell's view that it is as likely that the universe caused itself, as it is that God caused itself, I disagree, as does Copleston, with his point that there are some things in the world that are not caused by anything. I cannot think of any event, or object in this world, that does not have a cause. Even if its cause is merely the atmospheric conditions in that place and time, or the presence of an certain chemical, or the instability of that substance in itself.*

*Basically, whether or not you accept the Cosmological argument depends on whether or not you are willing to except the view that the Universe has a reason for existing. If you do not accept this view (like Bertrand Russell), then the Cosmological cannot stand.*