

I got an email from a Senior Editor of the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy asking me to document and support my criticism of this SEP entry:
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmological-argument/>

I submitted an initial draft, and promised to do a better job when I got hold of Norris Clarke's book, "The One and the Many." Fr. Clarke was my metaphysics teacher at Fordham. He taught us that the famous "five ways" were no good, but that the metaphysics of Thomas Aquinas, as brought out by Etienne Gilson, provides a rational argument, not a proof, of God's existence. The SEP entry only discusses the fallacious "five ways" arguments. My ideas about the "cosmological-argument" are here:

https://www.academia.edu/23340072/WHY_PEOPLE_BELIEVE_GOD_CAUSED_THE_BIG_BANG

In my essay, I propose a psychological explanation of why people think the Big Bang, biological evolution, and fine-tuning of physical constants is evidence that God exists. I've attached a lesson plan about the existence of God.

My correspondence with the SEP is at
<http://www.newevangelist.me>
Very truly yours,