

How to argue against the Kalam Cosmological Argument?

Post by “LAMAR__44” of April 7, 2026 at 8:43 PM

I feel as this situation is different to Zeno's paradox. I believe Zeno's paradox is actually true, in the sense that if you agree with the premise that space is infinitely divisible, then motion is impossible, however, clearly motion is possible, so Zeno's paradox actually proves by contradiction that space is finitely divisible or discrete (I have some confusions about thinking about the universe as discrete but that's a topic for another day, but I think it's much better at explaining reality than a continuous universe). Here's a good video I recommend everyone watch <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=iU59S5JDpSU>

Now the reason why I think this situation is different to Zeno's paradox, is that we solve Zeno's paradox by saying “well you can't actually traverse an infinite number of points, so space isn't infinitely divisible”, but for the infinity of the past, we are saying that there are an infinite number of discrete points (moments) that have been traversed.

We either have to accept that an infinite number of points can be traversed, which sort of undermines Epicurean physics that reality is made of discrete matter and time, or say that the past is a finite number of points, which undermines the eternity of the universe.

However, I am sure I'm thinking of something wrongly here, so don't take this as an attack on Epicureanism.