

Candidate 6 evidence

Is the universe and the things in it proof of God's existence?

I am going to investigate Thomas Aquinas, Bertrand Russell, David Hume, and William Paley views of God's existence. By analysing and evaluating The Cosmological argument and The Teleological Argument.

The Cosmological argument is an argument for the existence of God, by Thomas Aquinas. It starts with the existence of the universe and attempts to prove God does exist. Aquinas believed everything had a cause, so he asked himself what is the universe's cause? For the universe to exist, it must have a cause, 'every action and event is directly lead by another.'

Aquinas rejected the idea of an infinite chain of causes, as he believed it didn't make sense and there had to be a starting point. That a first cause started this chain of causes.

Aquinas believed God was the answer to this question, as he believed God was eternal, so he doesn't need a cause. He is spiritual so he is outside the physical universe, he is not a subject to the laws of cause and effect. Also, he believed God is omnipotent and omniscient, so he has the knowledge and power to be the creator.

His argument in standard form went as follows:

P1: everything has a cause

P2: every cause has a cause

P3: this cannot go back forever

C1: therefore, there must be an uncaused cause that needs to be caused

C2: the uncaused cause is God

A good strength of this argument is that it makes sense, it is logical. The logic of this argument is understandable. An action will lead to a cause and a cause will lead to an action. A book will only fall if a force has pushed it. This makes sense. It again makes sense that God is the creator of the universe as he is eternal, spiritual, omnipotent, and omniscient as we mentioned earlier. This is a simple yet effective strength. But Aquinas has just made a guess that there is a starting point, for all we know there could be an infinite chain of causes. And even if there is Aquinas has just assumed that God is the creator of the universe, rather than something else.

A criticism of the Cosmological argument is if 'everything has a cause, what caused God?' Bertrand Russell states it is not right to say God is an exception. He also

mentions that he thinks it is acceptable to think the universe doesn't need a cause, it could be eternal. Russell says anyone who thinks the universe has a beginning is just 'lacking imagination.' what Russell means by this is that the universe doesn't necessarily have to have a beginning. People who can't imagine this, don't have any creativity.

David Hume agrees with Russell and says we don't have the right to be confident that the universe does have a beginning. Hume also adds we didn't have any observers of the creation of the universe, we will never know if it needed a cause or not. And Hume states that if we can say God is eternal why can't the universe.

The big bang theory is used to disprove the existence of God as it suggests different ways to how the universe was created. However, I think the big bang theory supports the Cosmological argument. The big bang estimates that the universe has only existed around 14 billion years, this destroys Hume's and Russell's arguments.

The Teleological argument suggests That with the big bang our world should be dust and rubble. But since it is not it must have been designed by a designer. People believed God is this designer. A good example of why people believed the nature around us was proof of God's existence is the bucket orchid. The bucket orchid produces nectar attracting bees, this nectar covers the surface of the flower making it Slippery for the bees to stand on, causing the bees to fall into the bucket of the orchid. The bucket is filled with liquid not allowing the bee to fly out and escape. But on the side of the orchid there is a stair like path allowing the Bee to get out. This almost seems like it was designed for the bees to allow them to escape.

The bucket orchid is also a very complicated structure. This brings me to my next point. William Paley has compared the nature of our world to a watch. A watch must be designed by a watchmaker as it is too complicated. The human eye is also a very complex structure so wouldn't it make sense that it was designed to. If we had to design airplanes, cars, and trains why do we expect that animals and nature have just appeared out of nowhere.

A criticism of the Teleological argument is the bad design argument. A good example of this is the Quall. A female Quall gives birth to 24 children but, it only has 6 nipples to feed its children. This causes 18 children to die which seems like a pointless process, and overall, a bad design. But with the 18 baby Quall dying it causes the 6 children to be better adapted, than what they would've been, so maybe an advantage.

The Cosmological and teleological argument both have the same aim to prove God's existence, But the Cosmological argument used the universe itself to prove God is real,

whereas the teleological argument focuses on the things in the universe instead. After analysing and evaluating both arguments I have come to the conclusion God doesn't exist. The reason I personally don't believe God exists is the fact the arguments for God's existence are based on belief and don't have any scientific knowledge when as arguments against God's existence are more knowledge based. No, the universe and the things in it don't prove God's existence.

Philosophy National 5 Resource Sheet			
Candidate Name		Scottish Candidate Number	
Is the universe and the things in it proof of god's existence?			
Intro			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philosophers For - T, A W, P / against - B, R, D, H, C, D Going to... 			
Main Body			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For God existence by T, A Universe existing, aim / Everything cause / universes ... / for the universe exists... (6) 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infinite chain/ starting point Conclusion (3) 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> God is the answer Eternal / Outside physical universe/ Two Omni Standard form (5) 			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Logical - action led to action/ Book example (6) Aquinas made a guess/ chain of causes/ assumed 			
Criticisms			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> God cause/ God exception? Universe could be eternal/ Lacking imagination/ Doesn't necessarily have a beginning Agreement/ No observers of the universe/ dont know what this cause could be 			
Strength			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Big bang used to disprove/ support/ 14 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> God is designer World should be dust Designer- Nature - bucket orchid/ good example/ So complicated must be designed design vehicles, animals and nature Watchmaker and eye 			
Criticisms / strengths			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bad design, Quall 6 better adapted 			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Evolution Finches 			
Conclusion			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same objective/ Differences What i did opinion No proof, based of belief Against have scientific logic, evolution Answer to question 			