

# Candidate 1 evidence

Existence of God - Higher RMPS US Essay 2 RPQ

'How far can religious and non-religious arguments provide conclusive proof about the existence of God?'

One way in which science, a non-religious argument, can disprove God is the Big Bang Theory. This is the idea that the Big Bang happened around 13.8 billion years ago from a single point of implosion (KU). This point of implosion was a single point of singularity meaning from one point in time all time, matter and space began (KU). One piece of evidence to support the Big Bang Theory can be seen through the idea of the expanding universe. This suggests that the planets and galaxies are moving away from each other and in order for them to expand they must have expanded from somewhere (KU). Another piece of evidence to support the Big Bang Theory is comic background radiation. This is the radiation in the form of heat which is leftover from the Big Bang and this can be observed and measured today (KU). Another piece of evidence to support the Big Bang Theory is the quantity of elements. This is the idea that there is the exact number of elements in the universe. Some people believe that the Big Bang Theory gives an explanation for the universe meaning there doesn't need to be a God which goes against Leibniz's argument. The Big Bang theory is scientific evidence which dismisses supernatural speculation, and it is empirical evidence which has gone through tests and factual research (A). In my opinion I believe that the background theory can disprove God as it shows a way in which the universe has been created without the need for a God or a necessary being and the evidence is factual and based on evidence that we can see and that has been tested (E).

One religious response in the form of a Christian which goes as an argument for The Big Bang Theory and tries to prove God is the cosmological argument. Aquinas believes that every effect must have a cause and that string of effects must lead to a cause which he describes as 'first cause.' (KU) He believes that the first cause must have been God who as a necessary being which doesn't need an explanation or cause (KU). He does not exist within our universe but he can act within it (KU). Aquinas states there must be a 'first cause a cause which itself does not need a further cause I shall describe as God (KU).' One philosophical response to support the cosmological argument would be Leibniz who says that God is the only sufficient explanation for the existence of the universe. He believes God is the only thing powerful enough to create a

universe which is so perfectly made (KU). In my opinion I disagree with the cosmological argument as although there may need to be a first cause it does not mean that it has to be God as it jumps to conclusions and is not based on anything that we can see (E).

Through the cosmological argument we can see how religion can be convincing in proving the existence of God as it isn't just faith, it has been created through rational thinking. It is also where respected by many philosophers and has been around for years period however there is weaknesses in the cosmological argument which makes this argument less convincing as it was written by a Christian man which therefore can make has conclusions biased (A). It also says that everything must need a cause but to then say that God doesn't, can be contradicting and makes the argument seem weak and illogical as it just so happens that God is the only thing that doesn't need a cause (A).

One non-religious argument through science that disproves the existence of God is Darwin's theory of evolution. Natural selection is when a species adapts and evolves to best fit its environment for the best chance of survival (KU). This suggests that there must not have been a God who created the universe because if he did and he was a perfect later then he would have made species perfect so that they wouldn't need to evolve and change (A). Animals have also gone extinct and that would suggest that he didn't create a creature that would survive. In my opinion this argument is strong in disproving God as surely a God who is meant to be all loving wouldn't make species that have to suffer and fight to survive (E).

When that religious argument to support the existence of God through Christianity is the Teleological argument. This suggests that everything on earth is complex, purposeful and shows signs of being designed and in order for it to be designed there must be a designer (KU). One philosophical argument to support that a logical argument is Polkinghorne who states 'the fine tuning of the universe cannot be dismissed as just one happy accident'(KU). He believes that the universe cannot have just appeared without being created as it is too complex. One philosophical argument to disagree with the Teleological argument is Hume who says that the universe may have needed to be designed by a designer but why does that have to be God (KU)? In my opinion I disagree with Teleological argument as although the universe may need to be designed, I think that it could have just occurred without the help of a God.

In conclusion I disagree with the existence of God as I believe that religious arguments focused too much on faith whereas the scientific arguments have empirical evidence and have gone through factual research.

KU – 10 (13)

A – 4

E - 3