

Does God exist?

Philosophical Thinking Term Paper

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Cosmological arguments	2
2.1	Necessity and Possibility.....	2
2.1.1	Counterarguments	3
2.2	Contingency	4
2.2.1	Proof of P2	4
3	Moral argument	6
3.1	Counterargument.....	7
3.1.1	Objection 1: Humanly originated morality might still be objective	7
3.1.2	Objection 2: Moral language generates objective morality	7
4	Fine-tuning.....	7
4.1	Proof of P5	8
4.1.1	Laws of nature.....	8
4.1.2	Constants of nature	10
4.1.3	Initial cosmic conditions.....	11
4.2	Counterarguments	11
4.2.1	Naturalistic Multiverse as an alternative.....	11
5	Personal evaluation.....	12
5.1	Cosmological arguments	12
5.1.1	Necessity and Possibility	12
5.1.2	Contingency	14
5.2	Moral argument	16
5.2.1	Objection 1: Humanly originated morality might still be objective	16
5.2.2	Objection 2: Moral language generates objective morality	16
5.3	Fine-tuning	16
5.4	Attributes of God.....	17
6	Conclusion.....	17
7	References:	17

1 Introduction

Where did we come from? Why are we here? Where are we going? How should we live? I am sure that whoever is reading my words now has probably, at least once, asked these existential questions [1]. Among them, which one resonates the most? Probably the first question. You are not the only one since it has occupied minds of mankind since the dawn of history. But, why does it have such significance? Simply because its answer impacts everything else including the other three questions. Our lives would become profoundly different based on our answer. There are only two possible answers, each of which has proponents. Theists give the affirmative answer while atheists give the negative one. This controversy involves both philosophical and scientific arguments. The scope of this paper will revolve more around philosophical argumentation than empirical scientific dialogue, into which it shall not dive deeply. The paper gathers different types of arguments, cosmological, moral, and fine-tuning arguments. This way, it introduces a reader new to the controversy to the types of arguments used, and, to readers familiar with the controversy, it gives insight about each type of argument through criticism. Each argument type has a lot of details. However, I care more about presenting the core of each type. My aim in this paper is equipping the reader with a firm foundation for their future search in pursuit of the truth. The main focus shall be on the existence of a first cause. Nonetheless, there shall be also a brief discussion about its attributes. The paper's methodology for each type of argument is showing evidence for both theistic and atheistic views. Then a collective critical evaluation of each side's arguments to show which side argues more soundly.

2 Cosmological arguments

Although cosmological arguments could be inductive or deductive, our concern would be about the deductive ones. They are of three types according to William Lane Craig. The first is called the argument of possibility. The second, is the *kalām* argument, and the third is based on the Principle of Sufficient Reason formulated by Leibniz and Clarke. For the purpose of this paper, I selected only the first two arguments [2]. This paper will treat the two cosmological arguments as one unit since they are both connected.

2.1 Necessity and Possibility

This argument is advocated by Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae* in which he presents five ways to prove the existence of God, of which this is the third. It deals with causality outside the physical temporal context. The argument goes as follows:

Premise (P)1: There undeniably exists reality. We and the universe do truly exist

P2: Each existent can logically be one of two possibilities regarding needing a cause. The first is that it is existent by essence, meaning its existence is not caused by another, which is a Necessary Being. The second is that it depends on another existent for its existence, which is a Possible Being

P3: Take an existent. If it is necessary, we have proved our case. If it is possible, then there exists a cause of i

P4: The cause itself is either necessary or possible. If it is necessary, this proves our case. If it is possible, then there exists a cause of this cause too

P5: An infinite regress of possible causes is impossible for if all existents need a cause, no existence would occur. But existence did occur as per P1. Thus, the chain of possible beings must have been interrupted by a necessary being, not dependent in its existence on another

P6: The chain cannot have been interrupted by a possible being. A possible being cannot be the cause of itself since it would have to exist to cause its existence i.e., it would need to simultaneously exist and not exist, which is a contradiction

P7: The chain cannot be turned into a circle where a later possible being is the cause of a prior possible being. For instance, A caused B, B caused C, and C caused A. The circle clearly goes back to A caused A, which is impossible as per P6

Conclusion (C): This only leaves one possibility, the existence of a necessary being, an uncaused cause [3, 4, 5]

2.1.1 Counterarguments

2.1.1.1 Hume's objection 1: no being can be necessary

P1: Any being can both exist and not exist.

P2: Thinking that any being does not exist causes no contradiction.

P3: There is no contradiction in assuming that God does not exist.

C: This argument is false [4]

2.1.1.2 Hume's objection 2: the principle of causality is not a priori

P1: We can conceive the occurrence of uncaused events

P2: As it can be conceived, it could be real

C: There is no reason to consider causality a true a priori even if we find it true in our experience by induction [2]

Note: For the sake of clarity

Due to the differences in sources' word usage, I chose to keep Aquinas' term, possible when addressing the first argument since it neglects temporal context [3, 4, 5]. Instead of using contingent to mean mere causation, I shall use it to mean beginning in time as used in [6] in the next argument.

2.2 Contingency

The *kalām* argument is concerned with a temporal context. The formulation is Craig's. This argument is particularly common in the Islamic *mutakalliman* tradition. It could be summarized as follows:

P1: Everything which began to exist (contingent) must be caused (possible)

P2: The universe is contingent

C: The universe has a cause [2]

For the conclusion to follow, we need to prove P2. Three ways are chosen here. The first stems from logic and direct sense perception showing change and alterability in the universe. The second and third ways are empirical, the big bang theory and second law of thermodynamics.

2.2.1 Proof of P2

2.2.1.1 Alterability and change in the universe

P1: Parts of the universe can be and not be. They are generated and corrupted.

P2: Since these parts are contingent, they are possible

P3: The universe is a collection of possible parts, and is, therefore, possible

C: The universe must have a cause, which is a necessary being either directly or indirectly as per the necessity and possibility argument [3, 4, 5].

2.2.1.1.1 Russel's objection: fallacy of composition

P: What applies to parts does not necessarily apply to the whole

Example: Considering the following argument:

P: Hydrogen and oxygen are not wet

C: Water (H₂O) is not wet

This argument is clearly fallacious since there is a difference to what applies to water and its parts.

C: The universe could be necessary even if its parts are possible [4]

2.2.1.2 Big bang theory

The theory postulates a beginning of the universe based on the fact that the universe is expanding. The galaxies are moving apart from each other. Reversing this process means that they were closer at an earlier time. Thus, there must have been a specific point of a singularity with infinite density and gravitational force. This was the beginning of the universe with its matter, energy, space, time, and physical laws. Scientific explanation is irrelevant to the

singularity as all physical laws, time, and space themselves exist only after the big bang, meaning that the universe is temporally finite, and thus contingent.

2.2.1.2.1 Counterargument

2.2.1.2.1.1 Morrision's objection: No reason to think 'From nothing comes nothing' is true

P1: No reason to reject that something could just come into existence

P2: There can be no enough empirical support for the principle since even if all cases in the universe are found, they don't necessarily apply to the whole

C: The universe could have spontaneously come into existence without a cause.

2.2.1.2.1.2 Grünbaum's objection 1: The Big Bang Is Not an Event

P1: The big bang does not happen within space-time.

P2: Events are only possible in time

C: Since it is not an event, it requires no causal explanation

2.2.1.2.1.3 Grünbaum's objection 2: The claim of the universe beginning to exist cannot make sense

P1: We cannot inquire what happened before the beginning of time since there was no time before it

P2: Since nothing temporal existed before it, we cannot say the big bang was an effect

C: The absence of a first instant of time allows matter to have always existed even in a finite time in the past [2]

2.2.1.3 The second law of thermodynamics

In thermodynamics, entropy measures disorder. A more precise definition of entropy is a number measuring the total possible ways of atoms arrangement in an object. The Second Law of Thermodynamics dictates that this quantity must increase or remain constant in a closed system. A constant entropy indicates a system which reached maximum entropy, and is, thus, in equilibrium. Treating the universe as a giant closed system, it is clearly not in equilibrium. The difference between its entropy and the maximum entropy (of equilibrium) is huge. It is also known that entropy increases with time. Assuming the universe is eternal, it should have reached equilibrium. Therefore, we can conclude the universe began to exist. To summarize:

P1: Entropy increases with time

P2: If the universe was eternal, it should have reached maximum entropy aka equilibrium

P3: The universe's entropy is way less than this maximum. So, it is not in equilibrium

C: The universe is not eternal but had a beginning [7]

2.2.1.3.1 Counterarguments

2.2.1.3.1.1 Objection 1: Second Law is statistical not an exact law of nature

Even if entropy on average increases, rare random thermal fluctuations may occur and break this rule. The universe could still be eternal and indeed achieved maximal entropy before. However, a thermal fluctuation could have decreased its entropy creating our current universe. An infinite time makes this possible. To summarize:

P1: Entropy may decrease with random thermal fluctuations

P2: Maximum entropy even if achieved in the past could still have decreased with one of the fluctuations

P3: The eternal universe would not remain in maximal entropy forever

C: Our universe could be a thermal fluctuation of the eternal universe

2.2.1.3.1.2 Objection 2: Low entropy at a middle point

Models can be built in which the universe was at low entropy at some middle time rather than the beginning of time. This is time t . Moving in both directions from this time, entropy decreases. This means:

P: A model with a middle low-entropy t is possible, and in it, entropy increases in both directions

C: Entropy does not necessarily increase with time [7]

3 Moral argument

There are many facts felt instinctively by humans such as self-consciousness, sense of purpose, sense of morality and free will. For this paper, we shall select only morality for its particular importance in life applications. Based on it, laws are made and courts and prisons are built. We instinctively believe there is right and wrong, and that we are accountable for our actions since we are free. We choose our actions. When we do something, we could have done otherwise.

Theists' argument from morality is concerned with objective morality. Objective means the independence of any specific person or subject. This means there is right and wrong regardless of anyone's beliefs on the matter. Craig also adds the binding trait to the objectivity of morality. So, collectively, objective morals are independent of individual beliefs and binding. The argument formed by Craig seeks to prove that the existence of objective morality is incompatible with materialism as follows:

P1: Objective moral values do exist

P2: These values cannot exist without God

C: God exists [8]

3.1 Counterargument

3.1.1 Objection 1: Humanly originated morality might still be objective

This objection questions P2 in the argument. Craig reasons that objective morality cannot come by a natural process. So, if we admit the atheistic view and evolution, we cannot say that rape, for example, is objectively wrong. Thomas W. Smythe and Michael Rectenwald challenge this thought saying that merely evolving by a natural process does not equal the lack of objectivity as follows:

P1: We evolved morality by natural process

P2: Evolution by natural process does not mean this evolved morality cannot be objective

C: Objective morality can exist without God

3.1.2 Objection 2: Moral language generates objective morality

The same two authors still question P1 in Craig's argument by saying they can form an objective binding moral argument that satisfies Craig's definition without referring to God. The argument goes as follows:

P1: Lying would probably harm people

P2: Harming others is presumptively morally wrong

C: Lying, as it causes harm for other people, is presumptively morally wrong

The authors claim this argument is both valid and sound, and, thus, makes Craig's P2 false, since they produced objective morals without needing God [8].

4 Fine-tuning

The term refers to the need of something of specific parameters to function. An example of this is technological devices. They need a certain range of parameters such as conductivity and thermal expansion to function properly. These parameters are selected by the fine-tuners i.e., engineers, who designed them [9]. This argument is historically significant both in the West and the East. The fine-tuning argument centers often around fine-tuning for life. More vigor was added to it due to recent cosmological discoveries that showed that the universe is "balanced on a razor's edge" for life. Not only that, but Robin Collins takes it to an even higher level, which is the emergence of moral agents. By analogy with the technological devices example, the universe must be the creation of a fine-tuner to host life except that the fine-tuner in this case would be God [10]. In summary the argument is as follows:

P1: Our universe permits life

P2: Laws and constants which permit life must be specific or have specific ranges, respectively

P3: These laws and constants could be explained only as necessity, chance, or fine-tuning

P4: They cannot be due to necessity since they could have been any other set

P5: They cannot be produced by chance either

P6: This leaves only fine-tuning as an option

P7: If they have been fine-tuned intentionally, there must be a fine-tuner choosing them

C: The fine-tuner, i.e., God must exist [11]

4.1 Proof of P5

To disregard chance as an explanatory attempt for the fine-tuning, values of constants and existing laws are shown to be greatly improbable without intervention, both individually and collectively. This means that each individual one does permit life, and all of them were fulfilled together to permit life in our universe. Three main pillars form this proof, the fine-tuning of:

- 1- Laws of nature
- 2- Constants of nature
- 3- Initial cosmic conditions

4.1.1 Laws of nature

How are these laws appropriately selected to allow moral agents to exist? Five examples are chosen here to demonstrate this. Any changes in them would abolish life as we know it. These are:

- 1- Gravity
- 2- Strong nuclear force
- 3- Electromagnetic force
- 4- Bohr's Quantization Rule
- 5- Pauli Exclusion Principle

The absence of these forces without compensation would disallow complex self-reproducing material systems [10].

4.1.1.1 Gravity

This is the attractive force between objects. If this force alone did not exist, even with all others remaining unchanged, no stars would form. High internal temperatures inside stars generate outward forces. Gravity which holds the matter inside stars together against that has now

vanished. Stars are essential to maintain highly complex life because of the long-term energy they provide. Furthermore, planets also could not exist since gravity bringing particles together became absent. Even assuming they could exist, walking on them would be impossible since lack of gravity would mean floating off the planet without return [10].

4.1.1.2 Strong nuclear force

It is responsible for binding protons and neutrons together in an atom's nucleus. This force has special requirements to allow life. Firstly, its strength must be enough to overcome the repulsive electromagnetic force between the protons and the quantum zero-point energy of the nucleons. Thus, it must greatly exceed the electromagnetic force. Secondly, its range must be extremely short to limit the atom's size. For that to occur, unlike gravity, which is inversely proportional to the square of the distance, this force falls much more rapidly. Had it been like gravity in this regard, protons and neutrons of the entire universe would be pulled together. Even more, being 10^{40} times stronger than gravity between the protons and neutrons in a nucleus, the universe would probably be a mere giant black hole. Additionally, atoms other than hydrogen could not form. There would not even be stars due to the lack of nuclear fusion. This would surely mean no moral agents [10].

4.1.1.3 Electromagnetism

This one is also crucial for forming atoms and holding its components together. Without it, atoms could not exist. Moreover, energy from stars would no longer be transmitted to planets, making even simple life improbable [10].

4.1.1.4 Bohr's rule of quantization

According to Maxwell's equations, any accelerating charged particle emits radiation. Applying this to electrons, the emitted radiation means energy loss, eventually leading to rapid decay, meaning that no stable atoms can exist, since atoms could only remain for a few moments. This problem stood before Rutherford's model of the atom. This model viewed the atom as a nucleus with electrons around it. This problem emerged because of dealing with electrons according to Newtonian mechanics, which proposes that, like any planet could be any distance from the earth, electrons could occupy any orbit around the nucleus. Niels Bohr proposed a different perspective, which is the quantization rule. This means that electrons occupy only fixed orbitals. Abolishing this rule means no atoms and no life [10].

4.1.1.5 Pauli Exclusion Principle

Particles can spin either in $\frac{1}{2}$ or $-\frac{1}{2}$ direction. This principle states that two spin $-\frac{1}{2}$ particles cannot share the same quantum state. This rule prevents more than two electrons from being in the same orbital in an atom. Only two electrons of opposite spins can share an orbital. If absent,

all electrons would crowd the lowest orbital disallowing complex chemistry, and, in turn, life [10].

4.1.2 Constants of nature

Constants refer to fundamental numbers put into the laws of physics to determine the basic structure of the universe. Newton's gravitational constant G is one example specifying the strength of gravity. Relating these values to fine-tuning, the argument revolves around the precise range chosen for them, which, if had been changed, would have prevented life or moral agents. Three examples shall be chosen: gravity, cosmological constant, and the number (ϵ).

4.1.2.1 Gravity

Inside the nucleus, strong nuclear force is stronger than gravity by a factor of 10^{40} . Thus, in comparison, a billion, 10^9 , is much smaller. If varied by a billion, the Earth's gravity would crush any being human-sized. The gravity of a planet 40 feet in diameter, which certainly could not host humans, would be a thousand-fold that of Earth. Astrophysicist Martin Rees states that a world of strong gravity would require its insects to have thick legs to support them. Furthermore, no larger animals could exist. Our sun's lifetime is 10 billion years. Yet, a world with a gravity only 3,000 times our own would disallow stars with lifetimes more than a billion years. Thus, our sun could not exist in such a world. In short, life would be impossible from both planets and stars, and, as a result, for us [10].

4.1.2.2 The cosmological constant

The most widely discussed when talking about fine-tuning is probably this constant. This constant is a term in Einstein's equation of General Relativity. It can assume both positive and negative values. If positive, it acts as a repulsive force, expanding space. If negative, it acts as an attractive force, contracting space. The concept of vacuum comes from Einstein's equation. Vacuum means space-time devoid of normal matter. The equation implies that if vacuum has an energy density, this energy density must act mathematically, and hence physically, like the cosmological constant. There are many fields in modern physics, such as the electromagnetic field, the Higgs fields, and the inflation field. The requirement of fine-tuning this constant arises from the fact that almost all of these fields' contributions to the vacuum far exceed maximum life-permitting amount. Thus, there is a specific range of values in which this constant must lie. Otherwise, the universe would have expanded or collapsed in a quick fashion, and no stars or galaxies would have formed. Although the initial proposal was Einstein's, there have been many contributions to this constant later. Robin Collins combines them and proposes that this constant should have been expectedly 10^{53} to 10^{120} times larger than the maximum life-permitting value without a fine-tuner or a new principle in physics. Thus, as life has arisen, the cosmological constant must have been fine-tuned for it [10].

4.1.2.3 The number (ϵ)

In his book, *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces that Shape the Universe*, Martin Rees proposes six especially significant numbers for our universe. One of them is this number, whose value is 0.007. This number defines how the strength of atomic nuclei bonding together and the making of all atoms on Earth. To show how fine-tuned it is, if this number were 0.008 instead, no hydrogen would exist. This is because, instead of repelling each other, two protons would bind directly. Had this occurred in the early universe, no hydrogen would have remained, then no fuel for ordinary stars, and no water. Were it 0.006, a proton could not bind a neutron, then deuterium would be unstable, then no helium. The result is a universe of only hydrogen and, hence, no chemistry. Although such a universe permits stars, they would be devoid of nuclear fuel. They would end up cooling and dying. With no explosions to spray the debris back into space, no new stars could form. The elements constituting rocky planets could not exist either. That's why, like the previous two examples, this number is extremely accurately fine-tuned for life [10].

4.1.3 Initial cosmic conditions

It has been discovered that the initial distribution of mass-energy that could allow for life is within an extremely narrow range. Roger Penrose, a leading British theoretical physicist, attests that only absurdly low possibilities could produce a universe such as ours. The precision needed for our universe to emerge is significantly higher than hitting a proton on a dartboard of the volume of the entire universe. Low entropy is the most special initial cosmic condition. The probability of low entropy that would allow the birth of stars and then life must be within such an absurdly small volume [10].

4.2 Counterarguments

4.2.1 Naturalistic Multiverse as an alternative

This hypothesis could be considered the major alternative. It postulates the existence of many universes; whose existence is not in need of any supernatural explanation. With this, it would mean that a life-permitting universe occurring by chance out of a large number of universes is no longer improbable. It is the same idea as drawing all of tickets from the lottery. If done, obtaining the winning one would be inevitable. This would mean that there is no need for the fine-tuner as per the fine-tuning argument because obtaining a life-permitting universe is inevitable among a sufficiently large number of universes. It could be summarized as follows:

P1: Multiple different universes exist with different laws and constants from our universe

P2: With a large enough number of universes, it is inevitable that at least one of them becomes life-permitting

P3: This would mean that our universe permitting life could be a coincidence

C: Chance could replace a fine-tuner as an explanation for our life-permitting universe [10]

5 Personal evaluation

What I want to present in this section is a clear thinking system for the readers. This way is similar to establishing a building one floor after another. This building consists of the types of arguments presented here. I shall make connections to the previous arguments when addressing each individual one. I shall commit to being as neutral and objective as in my criticism as possible. I believe being neutral entails presenting each view according to its worth, be it weak or strong.

5.1 Cosmological arguments

5.1.1 Necessity and Possibility

I personally believe that both objections fail to undermine Aquinas' argument. He tries to prove why one is obligated to reach the conclusion of the existence of a necessary being as a first cause simply by proving the impossibility of all other options.

5.1.1.1 Hume's objection 1: no being can be necessary

This objection ignores the whole argument. Hume only asserts an unsubstantiated claim. Another point is criticizing the premises. No evidence is given as to why what we could conceive could actually be. For instance, would contradictions become possible if one could conceive them? Certainly no, which is why this reasoning is seriously flawed. By the same analogy, conceiving the non-existence of a necessary being does not make it possible. No evidence is given either for considering all beings possible although he is obligated to give compelling evidence to challenge this logical classification of beings. The final premise is also clearly flawed since there would be a clear contradiction if a necessary being did not exist, which is, as the argument states, the lack of any existence. This objection does not withstand scrutiny.

5.1.1.2 Hume's objection 2: the principle of causality is not a priori

Firstly, this objection faces the same problem when regarding conception as equal to reality without giving evidence. Secondly, even if we do accept these claims, the rational attitude dictates following the overwhelming inductive evidence against which he presents no opposing evidence. All human experience supports the principle of causality. Thirdly, this objection is mistaken in considering causality a posteriori, which I shall explain next.

5.1.1.2.1 Why causality and laws of logic are necessary truths

There are three main basic principles of logic, the principle of identity, the principle of non-contradiction (PNC), and the principle of excluded third [12]. These laws of thought are necessary a priori knowledge upon which all other knowledge is founded. One can only reason from them, but not to reach them. But why must there be necessary truths? Because if we need to prove every proposition we make, we would fall in an infinite regress of proofs and become unable to found any knowledge. Thus, there must be necessary truths needless of proof, which are these laws of thoughts. It is easy to demonstrate how we all use them as basis of all knowledge and reasoning. The principle of identity means simply that every single x is itself and not anything other than x. This is a basic rule we always use without needing to prove. We treat

each person, tree, desk or chair as itself. We know it by instinct and build upon it. That is why we know each of these words, chair, desk, tree, has a meaning in its own right. What follows is that the fulfillment of this meaning means necessarily the non-fulfillment of the contradictory meaning, not desk, not chair etc., let's call it -x. This is PNC. The excluded third means that there is no middle between x and -x i.e., each thing could be either x or -x and no middle between them. All these principles are necessary and intuitive. What remains is proving that causality follows from these principles to prove its necessity. For each existent we could split all existence to this existent and all existents except it, according to the three principles. Let's take a ball as an example. All existence for this ball is either itself or all other existents. There is nothing else, we encompassed all possibilities with this classification. If the ball moves, it necessarily follows that this movement must be caused by one of the two possibilities. The ball must either be capable of moving by essence, by itself, or, anything else must have caused it to move. If movement by essence is disproved, then it must be an external cause. This concept of causality is what is used by Aquinas', and one is bound to accept it as long as they accept the basic principles. But still, could one not reject these principles?

5.1.1.2.2 The consequences of rejecting thought laws

Simply speaking, rejecting these laws leads directly to sophistry. Rejecting them is rejecting that every word or thing has a meaning in its own right. This way, one could not found any knowledge or make any claims, for one must accept these principles to make a claim, even the claim of rejecting their necessity. What makes the meanings of true and false mutually exclusive is PNC. Hence, if we make a claim that the proposition "Thought laws are not necessary." is true, we must accept PNC to differentiate it from the claim that this proposition is false. Otherwise, the opponent is also justified to say, "God does not exist and, hence, also exists." using the same method. In the end, every word and thing would mean any word and anything. This way, we could not even talk about anything, let aside prove anything. This would of course be unbecoming of any philosophical argumentation. Philosophy could only start after leaving sophistry. Leaving sophistry starts from accepting these principles as a priori and necessarily true without needing any proof.

5.1.1.2.3 The obligations of this argument

Based on the foregoing, the least one must accept from this argument is the existence of a necessary being regardless of its identity. Following Descartes methodology, one must at least acknowledge themselves as a thinking being as known by instinct. The same instinct tells us that we are contingent, i.e., possible. Hence, we must have a cause or chain of causes ending to a necessary being. One might claim this being as the universe itself, which is the concern of the next section, but a necessary being cannot be contested.

5.1.2 Contingency

Building upon the previous obligation, we must note that for one to start arguing the contingency of the universe, they have already admitted the universe's existence as real. They are bound to this and can no longer deny its existence. Additionally, it is fair to bind the atheistic side to direct sense perception and empiricism as epistemological sources since they bind themselves to it.

5.1.2.1 Alterability and change in the universe

Direct sense perception acknowledges this claim, indicating that the universe is indeed made of contingent parts. This part is fortunately agreed on by both sides.

5.1.2.1.1 Russel's objection: fallacy of composition

This objection contests generalizing the judgment of contingency on the whole universe. To evaluate it soundly, we need to understand that whether parts and whole have the same judgment is a matter of analogy. For an analogy to be false, there must be a critical difference between its sides to prove it false. An example where the part and whole are the same in one regard is in a brick wall. The wall is the same substance as its brick parts [4]. Thus, we must examine the analogy to find if there is a critical difference before asserting. To make it easier, we could use the human body as an example. Each cell of the body is contingent, could the body itself as a whole be necessary? Certainly no. There is no critical difference between the body and its cells regarding contingency. A body made of these cells could never be eternal. If the analogy is about size, however, there is a critical difference between the size of a cell and the whole body. It is intuitively clear that a whole, as a collection of all its parts, is larger than any of them, the same way 10 is larger than any of 2 and 8. This is the same for the example Russel presents since water is a liquid while its parts are gases. There is a critical difference between them. Hence, the sound judgment is that the universe must indeed be similar to its parts in contingency due to the lack of a critical difference.

5.1.2.1.2 An independent argument for the necessity of an external cause of the universe

The last objection would be resorting to the lack of knowledge of all parts of the universe, and claiming that some of these parts could be eternal unlike the parts we perceive. Firstly, this is impossible for how could the unperceived parts differ from the perceived ones if they are made of the same elements? This claim is against both senses and logic. But, even ignoring that, this would be an argument from ignorance fallacy. Secondly, we must ask about the reason why the perceived parts are altered. It could either be due to the eternal parts unperceived to us or without a cause. The latter has been proved impossible in this paper. The former, however, asserts free will of these parts. However, sense perception indicates the total absence of free will in objects of the universe starting from small rocks to stars and planets. All of these follow strict laws. Referring to our concept of causality, the cause of the alterability of perceived parts must, therefore, be external to the universe. So even acknowledging an impossible claim such as an eternal section of the universe, there must still be a cause external to it. This way, we establish an argument from only logic and direct sensations without needing further complicated empirical data. It could be summarized as follows:

P1: Change of the universe parts is seen by sense perception

P2: This change could either be by essence or an external cause according to causality

P3: It could not be by essence since it would require free will absent in the universe which follows strict laws as per sense perception

P4: An external cause must be causing change

C: An external cause to the universe must exist

The significance of this argument is the use of sense perception acknowledged by the atheist side and the simplicity of reasoning without complication. We proved all premises in this paper. We shall also address empirical controversies for more emphasis.

5.1.2.2 Big bang theory

5.1.2.2.1 Morrision's objection: No reason to think 'From nothing comes nothing' is true

Nothing means simply lack of existence i.e., non-existence. Since both are contradictory terms, then according to PNC, this nothing cannot give rise to existence. Therefore, there is a reason to reject this stance, and it is irrelevant to empirical data, since it is a necessary logical reason.

5.1.2.2.2 Grünbaum's objections

The core of both objections is imposing physical temporal restrictions on causality. Nevertheless, referring to both Aquinas' argument and our established causality, the concept is temporally irrelevant in regard to physical time. The absence of physical time does not mean the absence of the concept of time. It could be clearer to establish a philosophical concept of time, dependent on the idea of formerness of the cause and latterness of the effect. There is an obligation of a cause to the big bang, because both change and creation cannot be from within the universe, and a cause must precede its effect with or without physical time. We are forced to accept this concept even if we could not imagine it.

5.1.2.3 The second law of thermodynamics

5.1.2.3.1 Objection 1: Second Law is statistical not an exact law of nature

We shall address the problems of the objection first, then refer it to our established points. Firstly, it could not be demonstrated empirically, merely a theoretical objection. Secondly, even if accepted, the more complex a thing is the more unreasonable its emergence by random thermal fluctuation would be. It is one thing to claim the emergence of small particles, brains, or even galaxies. But it is far more unreasonable and improbable to claim the same for the whole ordered universe [7]. Now, referring to the previous sections, it is impossible for this emergence to occur from the universe itself, due to lack of free will, or from nothing, according to causality. So, both empirical and logical evidence oppose this objection.

5.1.2.3.2 Objection 2: Low entropy at a middle point

Once again, these models are unsupported empirically [7], and the same reference to established points could be made. Change towards another state could not occur in this eternal universe without an external cause.

5.2 Moral argument

5.2.1 Objection 1: Humanly originated morality might still be objective

A material world abolishes human specialness. Material humans are also made of the matter of the universe. Any concept of a soul or anything similar cannot exist. Hence, human specialness cannot exist. Since matter is morally indifferent, anything comes from that matter cannot have morality, including us. Meanings of right and wrong, and justice and injustice cannot exist. It is a world of matter an energy. Material humans are mere chemicals and genes. Therefore, they are bound to the laws that rule these components. Thus, free will cannot exist either. These two points abolish morality itself from material world, not just objective morality. Now, assuming morality could exist, evolution could not certainly give objective morals since it is arbitrary. There was no intention behind evolving these morals rather than any other set of morals. In theists' case, however, God is all-knowing, and He intentionally chose a specific set of morals implanted inside humans for a purpose. There is no comparison between the two.

5.2.2 Objection 2: Moral language generates objective morality

Addressing this objection requires clarifying what the binding part of morality means. Binding means must logically be obeyed. We shall then test which side could provide binding morality. The theistic side has God as the source of morality. Morality, therefore, would be binding because of two points. Firstly, it is logical that God's knowledge far surpasses our limited knowledge. Secondly, escape from God is impossible. One shall be certainly punished if they disobey. Thus, it is logical to obey whatever morals God dictates. The atheistic side does not have that. Moral languages are made by humans in the end. If we are being extreme, even if all people of the earth except one person agree on a certain thing to be right, there is no reason to consider their minds' judgments better than that one person. In the end, we are all limited humans. Also, there is no reason to follow morals if escaping laws is possible. As a result, objective morals could definitely not exist without God.

5.3 Fine-tuning

Firstly, there is no evidence for multiple universes [11]. Secondly, even if we accept they exist, we must ask about the cause of their existence. We have proved that from nothing comes nothing. We also proved that an eternal universe where change occurs is impossible. But, even if nothing could indeed cause an existence, as with random thermal fluctuation before, it is more reasonable to assume the existence of one universe than a large number of universes. How many are we obligated to assume? I will use only this paper. I presented 8 different examples of fine-tuning. If we treat each one as a dice roll, the probability of a universe having their required

values would be one out of 6^8 i.e., 1,679,616 universes. It should also be noted that it is obviously an underestimate to treat each example as a dice roll. The same could apply with the eternity of a changing universe. Assuming one asserts the eternity of one universe as a brute fact, how would they explain the rest? How did it occur by chance that our universe specifically became both eternal and life-permitting? Finally, even with a large number of universes, there would still be no necessity of obtaining a life-permitting universe. As long as there is no intention, chance would allow all the assumed universes to be life-unpermitting, especially that life-permitting ranges are harder to fulfill.

5.4 Attributes of God

Until now, the discussion revolved around a first cause. But, after reaching a conclusion pertaining to all arguments, I shall draw conclusions about some attributes necessary for this cause. The attributes of the universe as an effect indicate the attributes of its cause by priority. Firstly, since this cause created the universe, it must have power to achieve that. Secondly, since this universe is contingent and change occurs to it, and it was tuned in a specific way, the cause must have will. Thirdly, the cause must have knowledge of all its creation to do all that. Finally, since there is life in the universe, and since the cause has intention and will, the cause must be living too. These are enough attributes, drawn by simple analogy, to identify what type of God could be accepted to exist.

6 Conclusion

To conclude, I presented different types of evidence to satisfy different types of readers. I personally find the conclusion is that all of logic, direct sense perception, and empirical data lead strongly towards God. The theistic part is stronger to say the least even if one did not accept its evidences as absolute. Hopefully, the firm ground aimed for in the paper came to fruition. Now I leave the reader to perform their own critical thinking hoping they are successful in their pursuit of the truth.

7 References:

- [1] “Existential questions.”
https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/engl_258/Lecture%20Notes/existential_questions.htm
(accessed Jan. 19, 2021).
- [2] B. Reichenbach, “Cosmological Argument,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2019, Accessed: Nov. 28, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/cosmological-argument/>.
- [3] “SUMMA THEOLOGIAE: The existence of God (Prima Pars, Q. 2).”
<https://www.newadvent.org/summa/1002.htm#article3> (accessed Dec. 20, 2020).
- [4] “1.3 Arguments for the existence of God.” Hodder Education, Accessed: Dec. 23, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.hoddereducation.co.uk/media/Documents/RS/1-3_Arguments_for_the_existence_of_God_The_cosmological_argument.pdf.

- [5] R. E. Maydole, “20th WCP: Aquinas’ Third Way Modalized,” Accessed: Nov. 28, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Reli/ReliMayd.htm>.
- [6] E. Ormsby, “Creation in Time in Islamic Thought with Special Reference to Al-Ghazali,” Accessed: Dec. 25, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iis.ac.uk/academic-article/creation-time-islamic-thought-special-reference-al-ghazali>.
- [7] E. Doko, “Kalam Cosmological Argument and The Modern Science,” *Kader*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2018, doi: 10.18317/kaderdergi.417640.
- [8] T. W. Smythe and M. Rectenwald, “Craig on god and morality,” *Int. Philos. Q.*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 331–338, 2011, doi: 10.5840/ipq201151335.
- [9] S. Friederich, “Fine-Tuning,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2018, Accessed: Nov. 28, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/fine-tuning/>.
- [10] W. L. Craig and J. P. Moreland, *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology*. 2012.
- [11] R. Stringer, “Two Fatal Problems with the Fine-Tuning Argument,” Accessed: Jan. 19, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://infidels.org/library/modern/ryan_stringer/fine-tuning.html.
- [12] “laws of thought | Definition, Theories, & Facts,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Accessed: Jan. 20, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/laws-of-thought>.