

**Question paper 2****Candidate 13 – Origins (Question 1)**

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1.)	<p>I agree with the statement life was created to an extent. Christians would be the side to believe life was created, whereas Science would argue it was developed over time. Christians look to genesis 2 for their belief of how life started, with the story going that God 'Made man from the soil' and 'breathed life into his nostrils' <del>showing us</del> to create the first man, Adam. From these quotes <del>we</del> it's shown that mankind was made from God's allmighty power, and he designed us in his image, highlighting that we were created by God. Adam was then taken to the garden of eden, and when God realised none of the <del>an</del> animals were a suitable companion for Adam, he put him into a deep sleep and removed one of his ribs, which God then used his absolute power to create Eve from</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>on the Rib, <del>the</del> A result of this is that Christians believe this is where humanity started, that we didn't evolve slowly but instead God made us exactly the way we are today, creating us in his own image. <del>with the same image as the animals</del></p> <p><del>and the same</del> I disagree with this view however, as evidence such as vestigial organs and common features among species clearly show a change through time, meaning we can't be the same way we were thousands of years ago, and I think it's wrong <del>as</del> that literalist Christians view this without acknowledging the evidence.</p> <p>There are two ways to take the genesis story, the first being the literalist view. A literalist <del>believer</del> Christian believes all the stories in the bible occurred as they are written, and the stories are completely factual.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>as the bible is God's infallible word and God cannot be wrong. As a result of this, these Christians are very narrow minded and rarely open to interpretation, while also rejecting any story that goes against what they believe as factual, which is a very closed off and weak approach to this. A symbolic Christian however, is more likely to be open to interpretation as they believe in the messages and symbols of the stories, and see the stories as a way of conveying these ideals rather than they are all fact and history. A result of this believe is they could see the story of Genesis 2 as a way for humanists position at the top and our importance to be conveyed, rather than believing that is exactly how it happened. They will also as a result be more open to Science's explanation, and see the messages from the bible and the evidence for</p>

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

the evolution theory to make up their own mind. I believe this is a much stronger view than a literalist, as it respects the faith that religion brings while also incorporating the facts of Science

The counter theory to the Genesis 2 story is Darwin's theory of evolution. This theory explores that through a process of natural selection, beings adapted through random mutations to become more suited to survive and compete in their areas. As a result of this, these genes were passed down and slowly over centuries the beings adapted till they outlasted their competition

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	through being more accustomed to adapting.
	A quote supports this for side of evolution
	Statosi
	'It is not the strongest nor the smartest
	species that survive, but the one who can
	adapt is'
	This quote shows how crucial the
	development over time was to our survival today
	and how this adaptability is what made
	animals such as chameleons so suited to their
	environment over time.
	A piece of evidence supporting the
	theory of evolution is the idea of a common ancestor
	Many species that are alive today share
	common features, such as the lion sharing a
	similar ribcage to us humans, linking species



ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

adapted over the years, gaining features that served a purpose to aid ~~our~~ survival but are now no longer needed. I believe that we were developed and not created, believing Darwin's theory due to the ~~amount~~ amount of evidence, and that his theory has went through rigorous verification and falsification from various scientists, eliminating all bias and highlighting it as cold, hard evidence.

To conclude, I believe Darwin's theory of evolution is the most accurate and concrete theory as it uses empirical evidence to support it's claim. However, I respect religions and their faith and believe a symbolic approach is the best way to look at it, believing the messages behind the bible than the theory of evolution, with religion concerning the

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>'why' and science answering the 'how' to complete the theory. It is better to incorporate both, with even Einstein stating that:</p>	
	<p>'Science without religion is lame, Religion without science is blind.'</p>	
	<p>Even one of the world's most renowned scientists understood that only by working together can you see both sides, as one without the other cannot answer all the questions; they do not have to oppose as they are two sides of the same coin, they can work together to complement each other and tell the whole story</p>	