

How to argue against the Kalam Cosmological Argument?

Post by "Cassius" of April 7, 2026 at 11:20 AM

Quote

Essentially, it argues that the universe could not be eternal

Quote

This point is consistent with Epicurean physics, which teaches that each *kósmos* is temporary.

And I agree with Eikadistes there Lamar_44. Eikadistes is using what is apparently the current terminology. I use the terminology I grew up with - "*universe means everything - the all.*" As I read it we end up in the same place.

[Quote from Eikadistes](#)

I'm speaking personally here, but I disagree with this on the premise of Karl Popper's delineation between verification versus falsifiability. Verification says that we have to experimentally verify things for statements to be true.

This is a recurring theme of some recent discussions here. Call it a matter of terminology or whatever, but I (and I think Epicurus and those who followed him on canonics did so) maintain that it is ridiculous to assert that before you can "know" something you must have "*been there done that yourself.*"

[Quote from Eikadistes](#)

But, here again, it might be better not to use ancient categories to organize the concepts we derive from modern observations.

And I would say that it also would be better not to let modern observations cause us to lose sight of ancient categories when those categories still serve a useful purpose and those categories are not comprehensively contradicted by those modern observations.

For example I would say that just because the observable universe appears to be expanding, that does not compel us to conclude that the universe as a whole is not infinite in size or

eternal in time. Some disagree, but I think those conclusions remain logically persuasive. And if you say "no the universe is neither eternal nor infinite" then the practical result is not "truth," (which the "no" chorus does not advocate for anyway) but the opening of the door to the presumption that 'god' is what existed *before* the universe (it if came into being at some point) or *outside* the universe (if the universe is not infinite in size).

Again, not everyone here agrees with my point of view on that, but (1) as far as I can tell that is what Epicurus held, and (2) the position that Epicurus held is of far greater understandability and practical benefit for non-specialists than the unending and unverifiable speculation that many want to substitute in its place.

If someone disagrees with my reading of Epicurus, please be sure to correct me.

Thanks to Eikadistes for an excellent post.