

## Candidate 1 evidence

Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Higher Resource Sheet			
Candidate Name		Scottish Candidate Number	
<p>serves a purpose, deterrence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use someone as a scapegoat. ruth ellis convicted of murdering her boyfriend david barkley, caused her to miscarry (CCRC) <a href="https://ccrc.gov.uk/decision/ellis-ruth/">https://ccrc.gov.uk/decision/ellis-ruth/</a></li> <li>• texas with the second highest homicides (death penalty) vermont lowest homicide rate (no death penalty) <a href="https://www.statista.com/statistics/195331/number-of-murders-in-the-us-by-state/">https://www.statista.com/statistics/195331/number-of-murders-in-the-us-by-state/</a></li> <li>• iranian males hung in the streets to standing up for women's rights. <a href="https://www.amnesty.org/en/">https://www.amnesty.org/en/</a></li> </ul> <p>Retribution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "eye for an eye makes the world go round"gandi</li> </ul> <p>goes against human rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Amnesty International holds that the death penalty breaches human rights, in particular the right to life" <a href="https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/death-penalty/">https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/death-penalty/</a></li> <li>• muscle paralysis, heart stop and sedation <a href="https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/executions/methods-of-execution/lethal-injection/overview-of-lethal-injection-protocols">https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/executions/methods-of-execution/lethal-injection/overview-of-lethal-injection-protocols</a></li> <li>• Thomas Creech serial killer on death row had his execution postponed because they couldn't find a vein (arms and legs 10 times)</li> </ul> <p>discriminates those who as less fortunate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "We believe that the death penalty is a cruel and inhuman punishment which discriminates against the poorest and most disadvantaged members of society." - death penalty project <a href="https://deathpenaltyproject.org/">https://deathpenaltyproject.org/</a></li> <li>• since 1973 at least 200 were wrongly convicted and sentenced to death". death penalty info centre <a href="https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/">https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/</a></li> <li>• Marcellus Williams, murdered white women, no DNA and paid eyewitnesses sentenced to death 24th sep but County Prosecuting Attorney acknowledges errors.</li> </ul> <p>Christians: gives consequences they deserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Some Old Testament passages permitted or required capital punishment for grave offenses against human dignity, such as murder and other serious violations of vulnerable life"</li> <li>• for example <a href="#">Genesis 9:5-6</a>; <a href="#">Exodus 21:12-16</a>; <a href="#">Leviticus 24:17-20</a> (from christ and capital punishment website also).</li> </ul> <p>muslims: deserve to face punishment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qur'an "he forbids all immorality, bad conduct and oppression" Surah 16:90.</li> </ul>			

**Page 1**

'Capital punishment is morally acceptable' how far do you agree?

capital punishment is when you commit an awful crime and the state sentences you to death because of it, you then get put on death row in prison until your execution date. however some may argue that capital punishment is not morally acceptable due to it taking away someones life however some would disagree with that as if you commit a awful crime you deserve to die. in this assignemnt i will dsicuss both sides to this argument aswell as bringing two religious opinions into it aswell i will then make an overall judgment on if captial punishment is morally acceptable or not.

some would argue capital punishment is morally acceptbale as it serves a purpose, one purpose is it can be used as a detterance . this is when someone chooses not to commit a crime due to the consequences that come with it. an implication of this is alot of crimes are done during the 'heat of the moment' meaning they are not thinking about the consequences and does not have cpaital punishment in there head when committing a crime. however is it okay to use someone as a scapegoat. this is becuae many people commit crimes due to various reasons for example Ruth Ellis who was convicted of murdering her lover David Barkley, he abused her so badly and caused her to miscarry due to punching her so hard (according to the CCRC website) this shows that her circumstance was not one to show people to stop them committing a crime becuae she was severely abused and lived in awful circumstances so we shouldnt show people pain and suffering, surley there is a better way to deter people? However Texas who has the death penalty legal in their states had the second highest homicide rates in the US in 2023 whereas vermont who doesnt have the death panelty legal had the lowest homicide rates in 2023 (statisa website) this shows that even with the death penalty in place in texas they have one of the highest homicide rates meaning the death penalty is ineffective in deterring people from committing a crime. overall this strengthens my opinion that capaital punishment is not morally acceptable as using someones as a scape goat is not acceptable especailly after all the have gone through and also there is clearly no evidence to show that cpaital punishment effects the homicide rates in the US as places that enforce the death panlty arent seeing much different and infact are doing worse. this also strengthens my opinion as people are facing deaht penalty like punishment for standing up for womens rights in iran, for example men in iran are standing up for womens rights but becuae of this they are getting hung on the streets. i disagree that this punishment is acceptbale and people shouldnt be treated like this.

some would also agree that capaital punishment is morally accpetbale due to it serving the purpose of retribution. retribution is when the offender faces payback and revenge for the crime they have committed. an implication of this is does the government have the right to take someones life when they are punishing someone for doing the exact same thing. this is becuae everyone has to face consequences for killing someone so why doesnt the government. this is backed up by the quote from Gandi which says "eye for an eye makes the world go round" this shows that the government is being just as bad as the offender and no good is going to come from killing more people. this strentghens my opinion that cpaital punishment is not morally acceptbale as there is no good from killing more popel and the government shouldnt punishment the offender byt doing the exact sam thing back. retribution also fails to improve the offender. this is because by just killing them it doesnt give them a chance to rethink and regret thier actions, i believe that the offender shoudl face a life

**Page 2**

long prison sentence where all they can do is regret their actions and have to live with that. however is it morally acceptable to kill someone if it makes the wronged person feel better? an implication to this would be that killing the offender will give the victim/their family closure and peace however this would cause a lot more pain to a lot more people as another family to lose someone as well. overall this strengthens my opinion that capital punishment is not morally acceptable due to it causing a lot more hurt, this is because not only is the victim and/or their family being in loads of pain but also the offender's family as they are losing someone as well so it is fair to make innocent people hurt more. Also the government should be held to a higher standard and should not be allowed to commit a crime in my opinion.

however some may disagree that capital punishment is morally acceptable due to it going against our human rights. this is because everyone has the right to life the death penalty would take this right away from us. this is backed up by Amnesty International who says on their website "Amnesty International holds that the death penalty breaches human rights, in particular the right to life". this shows that there are organisations that fight against the death penalty as they agree that it is not moral and that it goes against our human rights. overall this strengthens my opinion that capital punishment is not morally acceptable due to it breaking human rights, the UN adopted human rights in 1948 so by using capital punishment it breaks human rights that we have had for over 70 years, so even though they committed an awful crime I disagree that they should be put to death and instead they should face a long, hard prison sentence. another reason why some would disagree that capital punishment is morally acceptable is that it can be seen as inhumane. this is because one of the methods that is often used is the lethal injection. the lethal injection contains 3 chemicals one which causes muscle paralysis, one that causes the heart to stop and the last one sedates the offender (Amnesty International website). however these getting injected into the body which can be hard to find a vein meaning they have to be stabbed multiple times in some instances and also these drugs can fail which causes extreme pain to the offender. this shows that it is not morally acceptable for someone to go through all this pain, as even though they committed a lot of pain they still shouldn't be put through that awful pain. overall this strengthens my opinion that capital punishment is not morally acceptable due to the pain they could receive can not be prevented as they will not know it will happen until it happens this then backs up that nobody should go through that much pain. for example Thomas Creech who was a serial killer on death row, he was due to be executed however they could not find a vein in either his arms or his legs after trying 10 times, this means that his execution was postponed. this shows that the lethal injection and other forms of punishment can cause extreme pain and should not be used.

some may also disagree that capital punishment is morally acceptable due to it discriminating those who are less fortunate. this is because those who are poorer in society may not be able to afford good legal representation or support during trial meaning that could be falsely accused and put to death or face a too harsh of a punishment for the crime they committed. this is backed up by the Death Penalty Project which says "we believe that the death penalty is cruel and inhumane punishment which discriminates against the poorest and most disadvantaged members of society" this shows that those who are disadvantaged face unfair treatment which could be detrimental to their life. another reason why some would disagree with the death penalty is that there is too much room for error. this means that many people are falsely accused of crimes they didn't commit.

**Page 3**

this is backed up by the death penalty information centre who says "since 1973 at least 200 were wrongly convicted and sentenced to death." this shows that many people were killed when they were innocent and had no part in the crime this means that the government cant be 100% sure meaning they should not take someones life when they could be innocent. an example of someone who was fasely accused was Marcellus Williams who was convicted of murdering a white women however theree was no DNA wich linked him to the crime and the two eyewitnesses were paid to testify but he was still put to death on the 24<sup>th</sup> of September. after this the county prosecuting attorney acknowledges there was error made and that he shouldnt have been put to death without substantial proof. this strengthens my opinion that the death penalty is not morally accepatble as many innocent people will lose their lives due to the basic errors made by the government or juries as they can never be sure, it also means that those who are innocent may find it diffiucly to find legal representation meaning it could be hard for them to prove there innocents leading to the government killing thw wrong person.

Some christans would argue for the death penalty becuase it gives them the consequences they deserve. this is becuase they believe that when committing such an awful crime they should have a punishment that is fitting the frime they committed. this is backed up by saying "some old testament passages permitted or require capital punishment for grave offenses against uman dignity, such as murder and other serious violations of vulnerable life" (christ and capital punishent website) this shows that when committing suc bad crimes some christans believe that it is crucial to have capital punishment so they get what they deserve for example Genesis 9:5-6; Exodus 21:12-16; leviticus 24:17-20 which is also from the christ and capital punishment website. however some christans would argue that th death penalty cannot just justified. this is because jesus christ came to reform those who need it. some christans would believe in reformation other than the death penalty as thats what jesus christ came to do for example when jesus came to reform the women committing adultry in john 8:1-11. overall this strengthens my opinion that cpaital punishment is not morally acceptable due to myself and christans believeing in reformation improving anf supporting the offender more as it can be more effective than capital punishment this is backed up by an article from the guardian newspaper which is about jimmy boyle who was a awful offender, the guards discribed him as one of the most violent offenders they have seen however he spent time in berlinnie prison special unit where he went through the reformation porgramme which he was then considered as reformed and released from prison and didnt return, this shows that even very violent offenders can be reform, i do understand that by killing violent offenders it keeps them off the streets and keeps people safe however i believe more that people can be reformed instead of killing them as they could still be innocent.

another religious group is muslims and some believe is the death penalty as they deserve to face punishment. this is becuase they believe if they murder someone or spreading mischief in the land they deserve to face a severe punishment. i do agree that they should be punished however i disagree they should be put to death as it can be seen as immoral which is abcked up the Qur'an says "he forbids all immorality, bad conduct and oppression" Surah 16:90. this shows that muslims believe and back up my view that capital punishment is not morally acceptable. overall this strengthens my opinion as this shows that muslims and myself believe that capital punishment just

**Page 4**

isnt moral and should not be used at all. this is due to a number of different factors but just should not be used.

overall i have come to the conclusion that capital punishment is not morally acceptable this is because using someone as a scape goat without knowing they ful background to why they did it i believe is not moral as many people have different reason and circumstances for committing a crime. i also believe that even though people believe that the offender forfeit thier right to life when committing a crime such as murder they are still human after all and should still ahve the right to life as we have had these rights for many many years so things should not chsnge in that aspect. i also believe that killing someone as payback or revenage is alot immoral as the room for error is too big and the wrong person could be killed however i do reconise it takes dangerous people off the street however many offenders need mental support and to be hospitalised instead of being killed as they may not be dangerous and just ill. i also believe that the room for error increases as many people face poverty and are poorer so capital punishment just discriminates against them and puts thier life at risk. overall i agree with christans in the way that we should reform prisoners as it can be very useful for offenders to learn a new skill and be able to contribute to society instead of facing the death penalty as all it does is kill them instead of trying to help them aswell as the the death penalty being immoral as muslims said and also inhumane due to the pain and suffering it causes the offender. overall i disagree with the statment that cpaital punishment is morally accpetbale as i dsiagree with killing people and i believe tht they should soend a long time in prison rethinking and regretting their actions as that is as much of a punishment as prisons are disgusing and an awful place to live the rest of thier life.

## Candidate 2 evidence

Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Higher Resource Sheet			
Candidate Name		Scottish Candidate Number	
<p>legally authorised killing, United Nations principle</p> <p>electric chair, painful</p> <p>"Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed." - Old</p> <p>cruel, smoothly</p> <p>"If you forgive other people when they sin against you, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive others for their sins, your Father will not forgive your sins" - New</p> <p>helping criminals, reformatory punishment.</p> <p>change, adverse experiences</p> <p>happiness, harm</p> <p>greatest unhappiness</p> <p>unnecessary, protect public</p> <p>torture, trauma</p> <p>"eye for eye, tooth for tooth" - Old</p> <p>victim suffering</p> <p>dignity</p> <p>"Continue to remember those in person as if you were together with them in prison, and those who are mistreated as if you yourselves were suffering" - New</p> <p>empathetic</p> <p>trauma</p> <p>philosophy, human value, meaningful, traditional</p> <p>dehumanising</p> <p>stress</p>			

Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Higher Resource Sheet			
Candidate Name		Scottish Candidate Number	
<p>200, 1973</p> <p>"Learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression" - Old avenge, mistakes guarantee</p> <p>"Give justice to the weak and the fatherless; maintain the right of the afflicted and the destitute" - New protect society, unprivileged backgrounds, responsibility, aid criminals.</p> <p>Hedonic scale, measure happiness, long periods unhappiness suffering, satisfaction</p> <p>Guilt, US, Glynn Simmons, 48</p> <p>"If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just and will forgive us our sins and purify us from all <del>unrighteousness</del> unrighteousness" - New excused, reform confirm guilt, mistake</p>			

To what extent do religious and non-religious views agree with capital punishment?

Capital punishment is the legally authorised killing of a criminal, used as a punishment in some US states and other countries. The use of the death penalty is considered a huge moral issue, as it goes against the United Nations principle of a right to life and can often cause a lot of suffering for the criminal. Religious and non-religious views have differing views on whether capital punishment should be used.

One moral issue arising from capital punishment is whether it is morally acceptable to kill a criminal as a punishment. There are many methods of execution including the electric chair, which often results in a lot of pain and suffering for the criminal, having to be electrocuted numerous times before death, making us question whether this inhumane killing should be allowed as a punishment. The Old Testament states "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed." This suggests that Christians who follow the old testament believe that if you harm another human being, you should be harmed back in the same way, this shows support for capital punishment as Christians would want murders to be murdered, in order to get justice for the victim of the crime. However, I believe that capital punishment should not be used as a punishment because it is very cruel and degrading for the criminal, especially if the execution method doesn't go smoothly, causing extra suffering. In the New Testament, it states "If you forgive other people when they sin against you, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive others for their sins, your Father will not forgive your sins." This suggests that Christians who follow the New Testament believe that instead of punishing criminals, you should aim to forgive them and instead help them, showing no support for capital punishment and instead they would be more in favor of a more reformative sentence. I agree with this view as I believe that capital punishment shouldn't be used as punishment because criminals should be given the opportunity to change their lives for the better, especially for those who have had adverse experiences resulting in the individual committing a crime. Utilitarianism is the belief where they aim to create the greatest number of happiness for the greatest number of people. Utilitarianism also takes into consideration the action which would cause the least amount of harm and suffering for the least amount of people. This suggests that utilitarians would not support the use of capital punishment as the action of killing someone would cause a great number of unhappiness from the criminal and their family, and therefore would not be the best action to take. I agree with this view because I believe that the use of capital punishment is unnecessary because if the purpose of the death penalty is to protect the public, the use of a custodial sentence would be a less harmful punishment and cause a greater amount of happiness compared to the death penalty.

Another moral issue which arises from capital punishment is whether the death penalty is used as a way to torture the criminal. Many executions in the US have not gone as planned, causing the criminal to suffer an extreme amount, causing a lot of trauma in their final moments as well as for the criminal's family to witness. The Old Testament states "eye for eye, tooth for tooth." This suggests that Christians who follow the old testament believe that they would support capital punishment even if the criminal did suffer as the victim of their crime suffered from what the criminal did to them, so the criminal should therefore suffer just the same as them. I personally don't agree with this view because I believe that even if capital punishment is used, the criminal should be allowed to be treated as a human being and be able to save themselves some dignity, even though they committed a crime they

should still be given respect in their final moments. In the New Testament it states "Continue to remember those in prison as if you were together with them in prison, and those who are mistreated as if you yourselves were suffering". This suggests that Christians who follow the New Testament believe that you should be empathetic towards those who have committed crimes, and instead of punishing them harshly to think about how you would want to be treated if you were them, this shows that those who follow the teachings of the New Testament would not support the use of capital punishment. I agree with this view because I believe that the use of capital punishment can be very traumatic, and if the criminal is able to keep their life and be given the opportunity to reform instead, I think that overall society would not be negatively affected and the criminal would be unharmed but still paying for his crime. Humanism is a non-religious philosophy that focuses on the value of human life and how people can lead meaningful lives without following a traditional religion or God. This suggests that Humanists do not support the use of capital punishment as they would see the inhumane methods of the death penalty as dehumanising, and completely disrespectful towards the criminal's human life. I agree with this view as I believe that the use of capital punishment is painful regardless if it is meant to be or not, and can result in a lot of physical and emotional stress for the criminal, making it morally wrong to carry out.

The use of capital punishment is irreversible, making it even more morally questionable. In the US, 200 innocent people were wrongfully executed for a crime they didn't commit since 1973. This begs the question on whether capital punishment should be used when so many people have lost their lives when they were innocent all along. The Old Testament states "Learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression." This suggests that Christians who follow the old testament believe that you should be able to avenge someone who has wronged you, but also suggests that you should aim to be a respected individual who does the right thing and fix when things are wrong. This shows that Christians who follow the old testament would potentially not support capital punishment because using violence towards a criminal is not necessarily the right answer, and instead they should try to instead help those who are potentially struggling which resulted in committing a crime, correcting their oppression and doing the right thing. Personally, I agree with this view because I believe that violence is never the right answer, especially when it results in the death of a human being, and there should always be an effort to avoid such violence and instead aim to help the individual instead of giving them a harsh, unforgivable punishment. The New Testament states "Give justice to the weak and the fatherless; maintain the right of the afflicted and the destitute". This suggests that Christians who follow the New Testament believe that they have the responsibility to protect society from wrongdoers, and also suggests that they should be protecting people from unprivileged backgrounds. This can also show how Christians also have the responsibility to aid those who have committed crimes, as many criminals tend to have come from unprivileged backgrounds and so Christians should therefore care for criminal's wellbeing and reformation, therefore would not support capital punishment. The founder of Utilitarianism, Jeremy Bentham, also created the 'hedonic scale' which is used to measure happiness and how long the period of happiness would last to determine the right action to ensure the greatest happiness for the greatest number. This suggests that Utilitarians would not support capital punishment as the execution of a criminal would potentially result in a short period of happiness for the victim of the crime's family, however the criminal's death would not bring back the victims life so couldn't guarantee their execution would cause a long period of satisfaction. There would also be a great amount of

unhappiness for the criminal's loved ones for a long period of time, further proving that utilitarians would not support capital punishment.

Finally, another moral issue arising from capital punishment involves the issue of never truly knowing whether a criminal is truly guilty for their crime. In the US, a man named Glynn Simmons served 48 years in prison for a crime he never committed. Simmons was luckily only given a custodial sentence, however this could have been the case for many others who were executed before they could be proven innocent. The New Testament states "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just and will forgive us for our sins and purify us from all unrighteousness." This suggests that Christians who follow the New Testament believe that in the eyes of God you should be forgiven for your actions as long as you own up to your sins, which could show that Christians who follow the word of the New Testament would not agree with the use of capital punishment. This is because they may instead support the criminal's option to have a custodial sentence and be able to reform and have a new chance at life. I agree with this view as I believe that everyone makes mistakes and should always be given the opportunity to fix their mistakes and change for the better, and with capital punishment this option is completely taken away from them.

In conclusion, both religious and non-religious views have very differing views on whether they agree with the use of capital punishment. Christians who follow the teachings of the Old Testament mostly agree with the use of capital punishment, as they believe that sinners should be punished for their actions and suffer for what they have done, just as much as the victim of their crime suffered. On the other hand, Christians who follow the teachings of the New Testament mostly disagree with the use of capital punishment, as they believe that criminals should be given the opportunity to reform and be forgiven for their actions. Utilitarianism is fully against the use of capital punishment as the use of execution would not create the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people, so therefore would not be the best action to be taken. Humanists would also not support the use of capital punishment as they believe in valuing human life, and the death penalty does not respect human life and causes a lot of suffering, going against the Humanist values. Overall, most religious and non-religious views disagree with the use of capital punishment and would more likely agree with the use of more reformatory sentences. Personally, I disagree with the use of capital punishment because it causes an immense amount of suffering for the criminal and their family, and doesn't necessarily give the victims of the crime a significant amount of satisfaction, and therefore would be better to sentence criminals to pay for their crimes in prison. Overall, I agree with the New Testament the most, as it focuses on forgiveness and more reformatory sentences for the criminal.

## Candidate 3 evidence

Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Higher Resource Sheet			
Candidate Name		Scottish Candidate Number	
Compatibility between religious and scientific views			
<b>Paragraph 1</b>			
Dominant cosmological model Lemaître 1927 Evidence: Redshift of galaxies & cosmic wave background radiation "If they have eyes, they will gaze out on the same cosmos as we do. They will, like us, trace their origins back to a 'Big Bang' 13.8 billion years ago."			
<b>Paragraph 2</b>			
Evidence: Hubbles law- galaxies moving away at speeds proportional to their distance 1965 radio astronomers Penzias and Wilson- 2.725 degree Kelvin (-270.425 degrees Celsius) cosmic microwave background radiation that spread through universe. Thought to be the remainder of the beginning of the universe that scientists had been looking for			
<b>Paragraph 3</b>			
Days of creation Genesis1			
<b>Paragraph 4</b>			
Liberal Christians  Chris Done: "science can be seen as a threat to faith; whereas for me the more we know about the vast, yet intricate and beautiful Universe we live in, the bigger and more awe-inspiring is the God who made it all. Here, instead of science being a threat to faith, it's a way of understanding more."			
<b>Paragraph 5</b>			
Creationists  Sunday 23 <sup>rd</sup> October 4004  Whitcombe  Test of faith			
<b>Paragraph 6</b>			
God and science don't compete. God is the explanation of science. Constantly New Atheists set up the idea that it's either God or science. Even for atheists that is a naïve thing to do  sustaining all things by His powerful word."-Hebrews 1:3.			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
Genesis 2:15  Church no longer swears by Bible  WORD COUNT: 250 Words			

### How Far Can Religious and Scientific Views on Origins be Compatible?

The compatibility between scientific and religious views on origins has been an ongoing topic of debate for centuries. The scientific view on origins focuses on the Big Bang Theory and it being the cause of our universe coming to life while the religious view focuses on the fact that our universe was created by an all-powerful being with supernatural powers, God. We are all reasonably certain that our universe had a beginning, yet we are left with questions such as 'where did it all come from?' and 'how did it all get here?'.

Modern science explains to us that the Big Bang Theory is a dominant cosmological model which was developed by Belgian Catholic priest and cosmologist George Lemaitre in 1927 and it tells us that 13.8 billion years ago our universe began as an extremely small, extremely dense and extremely hot singularity which cooled down over time and has been expanding ever since. Martin Rees states that "If they have eyes, they will gaze out on the same cosmos as we do. They will, like us, trace their origins back to a 'Big Bang' 13.8 billion years ago." After the expansion of our universe began, the first molecules were formed to produce light and atoms collided to form stars and galaxies, bringing our universe to the state it is in today. The expansion of our universe can be backed up by Hubble's Law which was named after Edwin Hubble and his law explains to us that galaxies are moving further and further away from us at speeds proportional to their distance. In 1965, radio astronomers Penzias and Wilson discovered a  $-2.725$  degree Kelvin  $9-270.425$  degrees Celsius cosmic microwave background radiation that spread throughout the entire universe, and this was thought to be a remainder of the beginning of the universe which scientists had been looking for. Although there are alternative scientific models and theories on how our universe came together, such as the Steady State Theory and the Eternal Inflation Theory, the Big Bang Theory still remains as the most widely accepted as it provides the simplest and most accurate scientific explanation.

However, some people with religious views such as Christians would disagree with the scientific theory of the Big Bang. The Bible begins with the book of Genesis, in which it tells us the story of how God created our universe in only 6 days. On day 1, God created light and separated it from the darkness. On day 2, God created land and separated it from the waters. On day 3, God brought forth grass and fruit trees. On day 4, God created stars and the galaxies. On the final two days of creation He made sea creatures and animals of the land. God made all things according to their own kind, and He blessed them.

Some Christians such as liberal Christians do not believe that the Bible should not be read in a literal way. They believe that it contains stories, poems, prophecies, songs and letters which contain messages and the teachings of God which should be acknowledged however it does not mean that it is all necessarily true. Liberal Christians are open to accepting the scientific theory of the Big Bang, and they believe that God may have used the Big Bang during the process of creation in order to create our universe. This does not contradict their belief of a Divine Creator, but gives them a better understanding of how God did it, and links scientific views on origins with the religious views on origins, making them compatible to a certain extent. Some Liberal Christians such as Chris Done believe that science and religion do not contradict each other, we just have not put them together in

the right way yet. Done states "Science can be seen as a threat to faith; whereas for me the more we know about the vast, yet intricate and beautiful Universe we live in, the bigger and more awe-inspiring is the God who made it all. Here, instead of science being a threat to faith, it's a way of understanding more." Learning about the scientific explanation of how our universe formed helps us to gain a better understanding of how it was made, and the process of it all, meaning that we are able to appreciate God's work even more and acknowledge and understand it more while dwelling in His Word. Many key scientists were ordained Ministers, such as Albert Einstein who stated that "Science without religion is lame, and religion without science is blind." Without God, we have no purpose. God gives us a purpose to live according to His will, but we need to gain an understanding of science so that we can truly know our universe, so that we can be in touch with God's creation and have a deep understanding of His great works and his omnipotence.

In contrast, Creationists do not accept or believe in the scientific explanations of the origins of our universe as they believe that everything written in the Bible should be taken literally and that Genesis is a factual account of what actually happened. They take the Bible word for word, and believe that if people only pick out the parts that they think are true, or the parts that they want to believe, then it challenges every book of the Bible and causes uncertainty of where the truth really lies. John Whitcombe stated "What God wrote in Genesis is absolutely perfect. There is no 67<sup>th</sup> book of the Bible called Modern Science." Arch Bishop Usher even worked out the date of the first day of creation by using what we are told in Genesis, and he discovered that the first day of creation was on the nightfall of Sunday the 23<sup>rd</sup> of October 4004, meaning that our universe is nearly 6000 years old, completely contrasting with what the scientific explanation suggests. The main reason for Creationists' point of view on the origins of the universe is their faith. Faith and religion are not the same thing, as for example Liberal Christians are religious, however they don't believe the same things that Creationists do, or interpret God's works in the same way. Faith is the act of believing in something without needing proof that it happened, and a strong relationship with God requires faith. Many Creationists see the scientific explanation of origins as a test of faith, as our faith in God and His works are often tested by the devil to lead us astray from God. This means that believing in modern science or using it to link the Big Bang Theory with the Genesis account can lead to a lack of faith, and even an uncertainty in the existence of God making religious and scientific views on origins incompatible. Professor John Lennox states "God and science don't compete. God is the explanation of science. Yet constantly New Atheists set up the idea that it's either God or science, which is a naïve thing to do, even for an atheist." God is the reason that science is here, God created science just as He created our universe and He is the Beginning and the End, and He did not only create our universe, but He is still sustaining it, "For He is sustaining all things by His powerful word."-Hebrews 1:3. He did not just leave our universe after creating it, but He is continuously keeping it sustainable for us to live in, and for Him to live in us.

In conclusion I believe that the scientific and religious views on origins can be compatible to a certain extent, depending on how different people interpret it in different traditions and cultures. The Roman Catholic church stated "The church no longer swears by the Bible. Humans should use modern scientific explanations to explain the origins of the universe." Showing that even churches are accepting the theories and evidence of modern science to explain that the Bible is not a literal account of what happened, and that the Big Bang theory should be used to explain the origins of our universe. Many people are beginning to view the origins of our universe in unique ways, which

makes our universe even more special as there are so many ways to view the creation of it, and it brings people together. I personally agree with the Creationist point of view and that God has created our universe and is sustaining it, however He has brought us here to help Him take care of the earth and universe that He has given us. In Genesis 2:15 it states "He brought man onto the land, that he would take care of it." It is important that we take care of the earth that God has made for us and even though we all interpret the creation of our universe in different ways and have different understandings. Therefore, atheist views are incompatible with creationist views, however liberal Christians do not have a problem with theistic views. Overall, religious and scientific views are compatible to a certain extent because of the reasons stated above.

## Candidate 4 evidence

Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Higher Resource Sheet	
Candidate Name	Scottish Candidate Number
<p>1- Asymmetric warfare            "For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh but have divine power to destroy strongholds "- 2 Corinthians 10:4</p> <p>2- Chemical warfare            "Thou shalt not kill, for all life is sacred in the eyes of god"- exodus 20:13</p> <p>3- Civil war            "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of god"- Matthew 5:9</p> <p>4- Conventional warfare            "War is a defeat for humanity" - Pope John Paul</p> <p>5- Loss of life(consequence of war)            "Greater love has no one than this:to lay down ones life for ones friends"- John 15:13</p> <p>6- Injury(consequence of war)            "War only brings only suffering and loss, for the harm of one soul is never justifiable in the eyes of god "- religious response</p> <p>7- Impact on soldiers(consequence of war)            "A soldiers duty is not to seek glory in battle, but to protect the innocent and uphold justice in the sight of god"- religious individual</p> <p>8- Nuclear weapons(modern armament)            "Thou shalt not kill, for no weapon , not even nuclear justifies the destruction of gods creation"-religious response</p> <p>9- Biological warfare( modern armament)            "god created life to flourish not to be destroyed by the cruelty of mans hand"- religious response</p> <p>10- Chemical warfare(modern armament)            "Violence that poisons the earth and harms the inn comet is never justified in the eyes of gif-religious response</p>	

### Rmps assignment

Asymmetric warfare is when two armies of different military size go against each other in the sense of war, this war is mostly one sided. A quote from the bible states "for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh but have divine power to destroy strongholds"- Corinthians 10:4 .

This quote helps show that in the extents of asymmetric warfare is that the state that have more power have an extreme advantage over the other contender in the war, this means that because they don't have a lot of power innocent people and soldiers lives will be lost due to this conflict, and will be dying in a sense of collateral damage. I don't agree with asymmetric warfare as it is killing and hurting innocent peoples life's and the city's and towns that surround them, it is also not morally justifiable as they are then again killing people who had no say in the issues that causes the war therefore there dying for no reason.

Chemical warfare is when the use of chemical and chemical weapons are used with the intentional idea of harming and killing soldiers or civilians. The bible states "thou shalt not kill, for all life is sacred in the eyes of god"- exodus 20:13, this quote helps to show that every life is sacred and everyone's life has a purpose to stay, it also helps show that innocent people shouldn't be dying off of these highly dangerous chemicals, as they shouldn't be used in the first place. As they are dangerous and deadly. I don't agree with chemical warfare as it is un-useful and unnecessary and isn't any any helping sort of fix the issue for the war, it is just an excuse to hurt people in a lethal way. It is not morally justifiable as it is then again taking life's without an idea of the impact and damage they are leaving states, houses and most of all family's.

Civil war is when the war starts in-between the same states or country's these types of war only usually happen when one state wants independence or a sense of status within. The bible states" blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of god"- Matthew 5:9. This quote helps show the only ones who actually find content-ness and relived after the war are the peacemakers as they have stopped a deadly war between two governments in the same state. This war wouldn't even be considered if the governments etc weren't greedy about land and could just be happy with what they do have as being greedy never leads to anything for the greater good. I don't agree with civil warfare because then again it's taking the life of innocent civilians and due to the close proximity it's impacting both states very highly. It isn't morally justifiable as any war impacts both sides and leaves this war with hundreds and thousands of deaths.

Conventional warfare is when is when they use war in a sense of lowering the enemies territory, by using military support and not nuclear, biological or chemical weapons. A religious Individual states "war is a defeat for humanity". This quote helps to show that no matter how much you think it is a great issue to go to war about no matter the war it always ends up in more pain and hate than was before as wars can last up to years, and due to them there isn't a lot of humanity between individuals because the war sets up these barriers when it is decided. I party agree with conventional warfare as it isn't using the deadly superpowers of war which is causing somewhat less destruction between states etc, but it also has the idea of it still has the intent of hurting and leaving some aspect to destruction on the innocent civilians life's. It isn't morally

justifiable as it is taking innocent peoples life's away and in any sense of war nothing good rarely ever comes out of it.

One consequence of war is the loss of life, this is when one individual either involved or not are killed at the extent and consequence of that war. The bible states "greater love has no one than this: to lay down ones life for ones friends" – John 15:13. This quote helps to show the impacts of losing a loved one or a Friend can severely impact you in many ways such as emotionally, physically and economically. As their losing someone who they were either very fond of or their loved one and due to this then can be impacting in a sense of they've just lost an income. I don't agree with loss of life as I don't think it's fair for these innocent individuals to be Caught up in a war that they had nothing to do with creating and certainly done nothing in the sense of harming the other state, this isn't morally justifiable as then again innocent people see dying at the extent of these wars and that can never be deemed as acceptable.

One other consequence of war is injury, this can range from either psychological or physically examples of this could be scarring ,loss of limbs etc. This quote states "war only brings only suffering and loss, for the harm of one soul is never justifiable in the eyes of god- religious response. This quote helps show if you are so consumed in the idea of taking power you can take the life's of these people as if that means nothing, that's unacceptable as due to these wars people are losing there life's each day or getting left with life changing disability's etc, I don't agree with the consequence of injury as then again the second hand impact of these wars is giving an unneeded injury's as collateral damage to these poor individuals, it is not morally justifiable as then again it's still murder at the end of the day no matter the reasons behind it.

One further consequence of war is the Impact on the soldiers, this can range between many injury's but the most common one for the soldiers is shell-shocked or they can have signs of ptsd after the war has stopped. This quote states "a soldier's duty is not to seek glory in battle, but to protect the innocent and uphold justice in the sight of god"-religious individuals. This quote helps to show in order for these soldiers to seem to feel as if they have took anything out of the war if should be their pride of still being alive and for them to funky believe everything they done in the battle was to seek glory and not kill innocent people. I don't agree with the consequence of the impact of soldiers as even though they are being placed in the war either willingly or being drafted in by the government they are still dealing with the immense issues that can happen after the war is finished. This isn't morally justifiable as these soldiers are being left with life changing issues due to the impact of the violence.

One type of modern armament is nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons are known as the most dangerous type of weapon ever created, as these weapons have the power to knock out and completely wipe our entire nations. This quote states "thou shalt not kill for no weapon, nor even nuclear justifies the destruction of gods creation" – religious response . This quote helps show no weapon is deemed as somewhat okay but these nuclear weapons are too powerful snd dangerous if the power of them is put in the wrong hands , because even the thought of a nuclear war could in hindsight wipe out the world, I don't agree such nuclear weapons as there too overpowering and dangerous to even be considered as a helpful idea in war, it isn't morally

justifiable as it is then again an overpowered issue that would overall kill millions and murder can never been deemed as justifiable.

One other type of modern armament is biological warfare, this is when the intentional use of viruses and bacteria are used to kill humans, animals and plants. This quote states "god created life to flourish not to be destroyed by the cruelty of mans hand"- religious response. This quote helps show that everything from plants to humans is sacred in life and any one who try's to kill this is unacceptable as there taking away from gods creation . It is an unnecessary warfare as there is nothing the plants or animals done to also be at a point of being a target. I don't agree with biological warfare as it is harming not only humans but all of wildlife and the immense plant production that happens around the world, it isn't morally justifiable as it's then again taking the life of innocent animals and humans who had nothing to do with the ideas in this war.

One final type of modern armament is chemical warfare, this is when chemicals such as nerve agents, blood agents are use to deliberately kill and harm individuals. This quote states " violence that poisons the earth and harms the inn comet is never justified in the eyes if god"- religious response. This quote helps to show that chemical warfare is an unacceptable and severely dangerous way of being in war as it doesn't only impact humans it's impacting all around us which means it's killing of the planet as-well, this just leaves the states etc with more life changing and destructed life's. In don't agree with chemical warfare as a modern armament as it's not a successful way of helping growing issues, it just leaves deaths and destruction as it goes, this isn't morally justifiable as it's killing and hurting everything in it path and this destruction in no way is helping anybody in a state of war.