

Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities

---

## Evaluating Franz Magnis-Suseno's Argument for God's Existence: A Systemic Philosophical Approach

*Gigih Saputra and M. Rodinal Khair Khasri*

International Conference on Nusantara Philosophy: Philosophy of Well-Being:  
Revisiting the Idea of Sustainable Living and Development

M. Rodinal Khair Khasri, Rangga Kala Mahaswa, Taufiqurrahman, Dela  
Khoirul Ainia, Shoim Mardiyah (eds)

# Evaluating Franz Magnis-Suseno's Argument for God's Existence: A Systemic Philosophical Approach

Gigih Saputra<sup>1\*</sup> and M. Rodinal Khair Khasri<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> STIAMAK Barunawati, Surabaya, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Philosophy, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

\*e-mail: Saputragigih369@gmail.com

## Abstract

The discourse on the argument for God's existence is one of the philosophical themes in Indonesia, with one of the prominent figures Franz Magnis Suseno. This research is based on a gap in the absence of an in-depth study with a new perspective on Magnis's thought. This research aims to provide new insights through a critique and recommendations on Magnis's views concerning cosmological and teleological arguments. The author introduces a new perspective, namely the Cosmo-Teleological System Theory and the Systematic Critique of Atheism Theory. The findings of research about the ambiguity of the deepest nature of causality, the lack of integration between cosmological and teleological arguments, and the insufficient depth in arguments to ascertain the limits beyond the natural world, particularly regarding the possibility of immaterial causal chains in the origins of the universe. Another gap identified is the notion that the Absolute does not necessarily imply God, which can lead to the implication that the Absolute could be something other than God. Magnis's views on teleological argument, specifically the inconsistency in the use of principles of directionality and randomness. Magnis still permits randomness, given the possibility of Multiverses, and posits that our universe might be the result of a random combination of these Multiverses. Orderliness presupposes a final purpose, whereas randomness does not. Absence of purpose results in the lack of unified direction among the components of a system, which in turn leads to the absence of a cyclical pattern, a hallmark of an orderly system, leaving only chaos.

## Keywords

cosmological, teleological, systematic philosophy, Indonesia

## 1 Introduction

The study of the existence of God is one of the themes of fundamental discourse in Indonesia because it is related to the view of the world. Dialectic with atheism also continues to this day. One of the figures who studied this matter was Franz Magnis Suseno who is known as an expert in Indonesian philosophy. The Magnis Mind is found in the book entitled *Menalar Tuhan* (Magnis-Suseno, 2006). The author found a research gap in the form of no research that critically examines Magnis's thinking about the argument for the existence of God.

On the one hand, the author offers a new perspective in the form of cosmo-teleological argument system theory and a critical system theory of atheism to provide a more comprehensive and integral analysis (Saputra, 2023). From the new perspective, the author produces new analyses in this discourse. The author limits the object of study in this research to the argument of the existence of God based on the reasoning of the origin of nature. In the book *Menalar Tuhan*, Magnis presents two arguments, namely cosmological and teleological arguments (Magnis-Suseno, 2006).

## 2 Methods

This research includes a literature study that focuses on research on the thoughts of a figure. This research aims to provide new criticism and understanding. That is, the author gives criticism to Magnis's view of the natural argument of God's existence, and then the author gives several recommendations. This research is qualitative and philosophical, which in this case is thick with the nuances of the philosophy of divinity as the main method and framework of study.

Modern cosmology is used as an additional perspective to understand the mechanism of natural origin. The source of this research data is the book *Menalar Tuhan* as the embodiment of Magnis's mind about the proof of God's existence and the criticism of atheism. The analysis model in this research is holistic and induction (Bakker & Zubair, 1990, pp. 62-64). Holistic analysis is indicated by the use of the perspective of divinity philosophy and modern cosmology so that it can provide a complete understanding and review. The author uses the induction model because it is consistent with the typical pattern of the study of divinity philosophy based on observation and reasoning about the universe.

The author uses the cosmo-teleology argument system theory. The theory advocates that the existence of God can be proven by relying on reasoning about the limitations of everything, and its systemic interconnection with regularity and chaos supports limitations. The author relies on the principle of lack and need to construct the principles of reality that have consequences on the limitations of everything, both nature and the possibility of causality outside of nature. That leads to the conclusion of the First Cause/God. The streams of cosmological arguments are proven not to touch the deepest side of reality and are less constructive-systematic in reconstructing the principles of reality so that they experience various philosophical difficulties, and on the one hand are less integrated with modern science.

The teleological argument in the God Argument System strengthens the cosmological argument. This system shows that regularity is a form of causality and is only consistent with finiteness. Chaos is also a form of causality as a result of decreasing regularity. This also shows its limitations, namely the beginning and end or creation from nothing. The theory of the argument system also cannot be classified in the streams of teleology or cosmology that are widely known so far. This system becomes a new theory and the foundation of the system of criticism of atheism (Saputra, 2023, p. 139).

Critical system theory focuses on reviewing infinity by correspondence and coherence as well as its inability to explain regularity and chaos. It becomes the basis of criticism for dialectics with atheistic cosmology theories. The arguments of atheism do not form an integrated system because the arguments contradict each other (Saputra, 2023, pp. 170-172). The author reviews the formulation of the problem and the purpose of the research in the form of providing a critical analysis, and then gives recommendations to Magnis's view of the cosmological and teleological arguments in the book "*Menalar Tuhan*".

## 3 Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Brief Evaluation of New Atheism

Referring to the movement of New Atheism, the central issue used as the basis for its criticism of theism is the doctrine of theistic creationism. New Atheism offers a naturalistic and evolutionary perspective. On the theistic side, the doctrine of creationism has transformed into a more sophisticated form, namely the emergence of scientific creationism paradigms. This more refined form has developed within the Christian Evangelical tradition, particularly among Protestant groups (Sanchez-Sabate, 2021, p. 20). It can be said that scientific creationism, as an ideological movement, can rival the New Atheism campaign. Its main goal is to counterbalance the discourse promoted by Richard Dawkins, thus extending its influence beyond Christianity and into non-Christian religions. This is done to make all religious believers aware that the primary adversary is not fellow believers, but the increasingly radical and fundamentalist atheist movement, empowered by the campaigns of New Atheism. The New Atheism movement, led by Dawkins,

has targeted non-Western cultures, including the Islamic world.

Philosophically, both movements—scientific creationism and New Atheism—represent fundamentally different (antagonistic) metaphysical positions. However, it is important to emphasize that New Atheism is positivistic in nature. For Example, The epistemological controversy between science and religion is best understood as a conflict rooted in positivistic science, which aims to uncover the “truth” behind the origins of myths. Therefore, positivism becomes an important element to be involved in contemporary theological discourse.

The beginning and end of the magnistic thought on the study of natural arguments does end in uncertainty. It has similarities with what is revealed by Meinongian Theism in analytical philosophy. Based on Meinongian Theism, In referring to the divine object, it is essential to begin with the general treatment of non-concrete objects within semantic construction. There exists an ontic category called modal ontology, which attempts to capture alternative realities that mediate the conflict between existent and non-existent objects. This alternative is known as the “possible world.” However, within the discourse on divinity, placing God as part of the determination of a possible world is impossible, as it would undermine the ontological commitment to God’s existence. For a theist, the belief that God exists is a paradoxical certainty: the divine object is believed to exist perfectly in and of itself, yet human understanding of it always remains within a realm of probability. This probability, however, is not ontological but epistemological in nature. In other words, the articulation of the divine image within the semantic wilderness never achieves a complete representation of the divine object (Khasri, 2023, p. 211).

### 3.2 Fruitful Dialog Between Theism and Atheism

Magnis on the one hand shows the aspect of probability especially the power of reason in ensuring that natural arguments are valid to prove the existence of God. This matter, in the tradition of analytical philosophy can be found in meinongian theism. Based on Meinongian theism, the theism-atheism dialogue, there needs to be a transcendence beyond the one-sided exchange between theology and anti-theology, toward a more constructive dialogue at the analytical level. This means that the ontological debate about the existence of God—within the ontological problems of divinity discussed in the domain of theology—needs to be expanded into semantic issues. In this way, the discourse would be more focused on the “modes of talking about reality” rather than merely on claims of “direct access to reality,” especially divine reality. However, the main challenge in applying this strategy lies in the general tendency of analytic philosophy to lean toward atheism. In other words, semantic constructions and other propositional acts face a dilemma concerning their stance toward the reality being expressed. This relates to one of the research questions: “Is it possible for a believer to adopt both a realist and anti-realist stance simultaneously?” The logical consequence of this is the need for clarity regarding the limits and correlation between ontological commitment and epistemic stance, which in turn implies the ontological status of semantic objects and the epistemic status of statements that refer to objects beyond the natural world or the supernatural realm (Khasri, 2023, pp. 210-211).

So far, the dialogue between theism and atheism has remained dominated by theology-centric arguments and unfruitful atheist rebuttals. This indicates a clash between naturalistic and supernaturalistic worldviews. These two perspectives cannot be reconciled under a single assumption of “fusion,” but can only meet within a dialectical space of dialogue—namely, by reexamining the categories of “modes of being” of objects, particularly semantic objects. In this way, the evaluation of a statement’s meaningfulness can go beyond ontic status, moving past a strictly dualistic demarcation between what exists and what does not exist (Khasri, 2023, pp. 210-211).

On the other hand, Magnis built a very realistic natural argument based on natural reasoning in terms of teleological/fine tuning and kalam-contingency. The arguments also need to be reviewed comprehensively and systemically because Magnis also tries to show the relationship between the two large classification of arguments.

### 3.3 Questioning Franz Magnis-Suseno's Argument on God's Existence

The author assesses that there is an impression of pessimism towards the power of reason in compiling the argument for the existence of God. Magnis's paradigm is not to find indisputable arguments, but only to provide a basis for faith (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 147). The paradigm certainly results in fundamental evaluations so that it is not enough as a satisfactory basis for faith. The foundation of faith also requires an objective and comprehensive argument. If there are still gaps, then humans are required to repair and even provide reconstruction. More than that, atheism needs to be answered (Kohli & Haslam, 2015, pp. 1-4). Atheism is increasingly developing cutting-edge arguments in the form of materialistic cosmological theories (Linford, 2022, pp. 1-4).

Magnis uses cosmological and teleological arguments as *aposteriori* arguments, but the exposure of these two arguments does not form an integrated argument system or at least minimizes the explanation of the function and position of the two arguments. The two arguments work alone without any relationship with each other to complement each other. That will cause a new problem, namely whether the two arguments complement each other or are not related. Another possibility is that the arguments are contradictory, but there is no explanation about it.

Magnis only explains in general that cosmological arguments can underlie teleological arguments, but there is no explanation of the function and position between the two (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, 135). After studying the cosmology argument, Magnis turned to explaining the teleology argument (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, pp. 135-136). The cosmological argument is actually not only an *a priori*, but also departs from experience and as a scientific foundation. It means that there is objectivity and not only coherent logic. In terms of something that is relatively cannot be absolute and indeed it is objective and clear (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 131). This is because there is an intrinsic conflict between the two. The limitation of causality knows the beginning, process, and end, while infinity does not know the beginning and end, but there are only processes that do not begin and end. Relative numbers and finite numbers will remain finite, even if added continuously. It further shows the lack, need, and dependence on each other, which shows the limitations of everything.

The author highlights another thing about the statement that anything in nature is conditioned due to its limitations (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 133). Is the principle of limitation the only principle that underlies the conditioned state of nature? If not, what principles need to be explained to underlie the conditioned situation? Then what is the systemic arrangement between these principles, and what is the most basic principle? This is poorly explained by Magnis in the exposition of cosmological arguments. On the other hand, the exposure of Magnis still deserves to be appreciated because there is still an effort to claim the essence of causality.

The author sees that understanding nature systemically becomes a fundamental view. It is beneficial to understand reality completely and satisfactorily to ensure the limitations of everything. Systemic and radical views on causality can also provide radical, thorough, and systemic criticism of the materialistic infinity of nature. The point of debate between theism and atheism targets the theme of causality as the central theme (Chan, 2019, pp. 395-400). It requires a radical and systemic understanding so that it can understand causality objectively, integrally, and comprehensively.

Magnis supports the creation of nothing, and the author also agrees on this (Magnis, 2006, p. 133). The creation of nothing is consistent with the relativity and limitations of nature. Relativity and Limitations have consequences until existential limitations or this nature is created from nothing. On the one hand, creation from nothing is also avoided from various contradictions of infinity, but it still acknowledges the existence of God. The infinity of nature shows the stability of nature, so that some reject the beginning and the end. This view also implicitly points to the fact that nature continues to be organized or hinders chaos to its peak, which has consequences in the end of everything. This is contrary to the fact that the increasing chaos of nature (Hawking, 2013, pp. 142-143).

Some development of arguments can be added, especially by integrating the arguments of the philosophy of divinity and modern cosmology. Modern cosmology, in this case, is the Big Bang theory that also explains the beginning of the universe 13.8 billion years ago. The author realizes that there are indeed

many interpretations versions of the Big Bang theory that lead to materialism-atheism, but all versions are speculative and unproven. For example, the Big Bounce theory cannot explain the scientific mechanism that can restore the chaos of nature to be organized again in the mechanism of development and the development of an infinite number.

Magnis, in explaining cosmological arguments, does not explain the mechanism of science to further complement and support the philosophical approach as the main approach. The dialectic towards atheism based on modern cosmology needs to be the main focus as well, considering the development of atheism in the contemporary era often uses modern science arguments based on materialism (Kontou & Olum, 2021, pp. 1-5). A more in-depth scientific explanation can also help to show the beginning of nature. It will be interpreted philosophically as the limitation of nature in the form of creation from nothing.

Another review of Magnis's explanation of cosmological arguments is on the possibility of this natural causality. Magnis explained that if there is a realm other than this nature, then he is also limited. The author understands that Magnis tends to choose the limit of causality outside nature (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 134). Another problem is whether this natural causality also applies to this natural cause? Is it strong enough that nature was created from nothing, so there is an Absolute Immaterial? What about the possibility of other immaterial series? Magnis does not study this matter and still leaves a big hole to reach the Absolute Existence. On the other hand, the author appreciates Magnis' reasoning rather than Craig's argument that only relies on Ockham's Razor (Craig, 2016, pp. 13-19). That does not answer the infinite regress argument satisfactorily.

The logical consequence is that criticism of atheism is also less integral and comprehensive because there are still gaps that cause doubts. Atheism often puts forward the argument of infinite immaterial regression. The possibility of infinity needs to be criticized in depth to strengthen the generative logic that infinity is universal even outside of nature, in the theme of the origin of nature and the proof of God's existence. The author still appreciates the depth of the study of Magnis which discusses this causality outside of nature. It is useful to reduce the gaps that hinder logic from doing philosophical-generative analysis.

The next review in this book is about the identity of Absolute Existence, which is not necessarily God (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, pp. 134-135). If drawn from the initial paradigm, then the conclusion is a logical consequence that cannot be avoided. The seemingly pessimistic paradigm and the absence of a system between the arguments of cosmology and teleology produce an indecisive conclusion, especially about the existence of God.

The premise that the Absolute Existence is not necessarily God can lead to implications that undermine the overall cosmological argument. Magnis has explained that this nature is relative and the consequence is the existence of the Absolute (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 134). What if the Absolute has two or three realities? It is a contradictory thing and frames that the Absolute is also bound by causality because of similarities with others. Is God absolutely absolute? The answer must be yes because if not, then God also has similarities with creatures. It also shows the analysis of the relative and limitations of nature as a whole. It means, the Absolute is only God, and otherwise God must be absolute. This results in contradictions and invalidity in the premise that Absolute Existence is not necessarily God. Absolute Existence is only God and relative existence is only bound by causality or a creature. It is impossible for a relative existence not to be a creature and of course, a creature must be relative. It is a typical identity that cannot be mixed with each other.

Magnis in the end judged that the cosmological argument was unable to prove the existence of God. Magnis does not provide a new theoretical or conceptual reconstruction to fill the large gaps of cosmological arguments. Magnis explained that after proving the existence of the Absolute (although it is not confirmed as God) with cosmological arguments. Next, Magnis criticized materialism-atheism and agnosticism. The strange thing is that after the conclusion, Magnis continued to explain the teleological argument. It can be found at the beginning of the explanation of the teleology argument (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 135). The systematics shows the lack of unity between the arguments of cosmology and teleology. The two arguments are explained separately, although Magnis states that the cosmological argument underlies the teleological argument. In the study of natural arguments, there is no further and detailed



explanation of how the systemic relationship between the arguments of cosmology and teleology. Another strange thing is the statement that Magnis has denied atheism, but has not fully completed the study of the argument for the existence of God. It can have an effect on the quality of criticism of atheism.

Another evaluation of Magnis's teleology argument about the possibility of coincidence, although the direction can also explain this natural order (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 146). Those two things are actually contradictory. Direction shows a design that is supported by universal laws of nature that are consistent with the same goal. On the one hand, coincidences indicate the absence of a destination or finish line and all natural processes are random, which characterizes atheistic cosmology. Materialist cosmology relies on the infinity of the number of nature or the huge number of nature and can explain itself.

Magnis's explanation of the argument of natural regularity experienced a fundamental reduction due to a lack of study of the fact of growing natural chaos. Magnis also fails to study the systemic relationship between chaos and regularity. A systematic study between causality, chaos, and regularity will be able to explain the end of this universe as the finish line (Saputra, 2023, p. 187).

The study of natural limitations can be a solid foundation to understand regularity and chaos. Limitations have consequences at the beginning and end of nature. It is in line with the highest level of universal regularity, which leads to the end of everything as the ultimate goal of nature. The end of nature is the peak of increasing and stagnant chaos. Limitations ensure that regularity and chaos are the result of design. The consequence is that all these natural elements lead to the same goal, namely, the destruction/end of nature. The laws of nature also consistently lead to the end of nature. On the other hand, increasing entropy will cause increasing chaos.

Another consequence is that there is no random mechanism based on the Multiverse mechanism in these laws of nature, because all lead to chaos initiated by the highest level of regularity. This is a consequence of universal limitation (Saputra, 2023, p. 191). On the other hand, Magnis has not solved the problem of the plural universe about the proof of its existence. That is what causes there to be an interpretation of coincidence, in addition to the lack of systemic study between causality, regularity, and chaos. The problem of the plural universe has not yet been resolved, and may not be realized by Magnis as a dangerous thing for cosmology and teleology arguments. The plural universe theory is less consistent with the Magnis view that limits causality, even outside the universe. The plural universe in a large limited number also has no scientific proof and is still open to accidental interpretations without involving the role of God. It becomes an anomaly and a fundamental contradiction in Magnis's view.

If examined more deeply, then the cosmological argument shows the infinity and begins with the Absolute (not necessarily God). On the other hand, Magnis explained that there is still a possibility of a plural universe. In the study of teleology, Magnis still allows this argument as a guide for people who believe in God, although Magnis still judges that the argument cannot prove the existence of God. These statements clearly show a fundamental contradiction. It will not provide a complete and systematic understanding of reality. It is further complicated by the lack of studies on the increasing chaos of nature.

The infinite plural universe that relies on opportunities to produce nature occupied by humans also gives a new problem (Saputra, 2023). The design of our universe must go beyond the possibility of designing other universes. It is contradictory because infinity will not be able to pass because one step must be preceded by an infinite number of steps (Kreeft, 2008, p. 2007). If these steps can be passed, then it is actually a finite series. On the one hand, our universe has a very clear beginning and has a limited development.

Another difficulty caused by the plural universe theory is that it cannot avoid various speculations. How is the scientific mechanism and details of the random chance to produce this universe? How is the combination of other universes to produce our universe? Is the chaos also increasing in the mechanism of the formation of the universe? If not, then what law can replace the mechanism that chaos is increasing? These fundamental questions will never be answered by the infinite universe theory.

Magnis ends the discussion of teleological arguments in accordance with the paradigm that there is no absolute argument. On the other hand, Magnis still states that the view of design due to coincidence is an illogical thing. This is contrary to the view of Magnis, which still opens the possibility of coincidence in natural design (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, p. 146).

In the end, Magnis has the impression that this argument is beneficial for believers. There is an impression that the argument for the existence of God has not been completed, but Magnis has concluded that with faith, this argument can lead to the existence of God. It is considered by Magnis as a more reasonable thing than materialism. It is no different than circular logic, and there is no reconstruction afterwards. The teleological arguments explained by Magnis also tend to lack new explanations and provide reconstruction or improvements from the previous version. Magnis just uses this argument, and of course, it is not a satisfactory and convincing way (Magnis-Suseno, 2006, pp. 146-149).

The Magnis position seems to tend to be in a deconstructive position rather than a reconstructive. If there is a recommendation or reconstruction after deconstruction, then it is a more constructive and comprehensive step. Magnis leaves a gap because it does not provide reconstruction in terms of the argument for the existence of God based on the reasoning of the origin of nature. The step seems to avoid the big question about the argument of God's existence and the question of the origin of nature.

Based on a critical study of Magnis's thought, the author gave some constructive recommendations. The author compiles systemic recommendations starting from the most fundamental things to the arguments.

The first recommendation is on a paradigm shift. From the beginning, there has been a paradigmatic framing that there will be no absolute argument or all natural arguments must have fundamental gaps. The paradigmatic framing in the end did not produce a reconstruction to patch the gaps in the cosmology and teleology arguments.

Systemic reconstruction also needs to fill the gaps in the function and position of cosmology and teleology arguments as a paradigm shift. The cosmological argument examines causality and the teleological argument discusses the order of nature. Causality, regularity, and chaos are elements that shape reality and need to be reconstructed systemically so as to produce objective and comprehensive arguments. Systematic studies can also avoid contradictions between the two arguments.

The cosmology argument has a more fundamental position than teleology because order is only a form of causality besides chaos. The study of causality needs to ensure the deepest nature of causality and the construction of philosophical principles that make up causality, so that it leads to the finiteness of this natural causality. After that, how to put order and chaos on the foundation of causality. It will show the systemic integration between beginning, end, regularity, and chaos (Saputra, 2023, p. 191). These steps will be able to provide a complete picture of reality and start with creation from nothing.

The last step is to compile generative logic in the form of limitations in the possible series of immaterial causalities involved in this natural cause. It will provide a strong argument to reach the conclusion of God as the Absolute. In addition, steps to give criticism to the decline of the immaterial series are also necessary for dialectics with atheism (Saputra, 2023, pp. 116-1118).

Systemic reconstruction is not only needed in the argument of God's existence, but also criticism of atheism. Magnis gave some criticism of atheism, but did not form an integrated system. Magnis studies natural arguments that tend to be philosophical, but Magnis also provides scientific analysis. The philosophical pattern is indeed thicker, and ideally, it is like that. In this case, the author highlights the use of the Big Bang theory. Magnis lacks to provide a more comprehensive and in-depth study of the Big Bang theory, especially in the study of cosmological arguments. The author recommends that a chronological study on the origin of nature, based on the chronological Big Bang theory, will help a lot in explaining the scientific mechanism of the beginning of nature and the highest degree of natural regularity when the beginning of nature occurs. Further explanation will also be able to predict the scientific mechanism of the end of nature.

A more in-depth explanation of the Big Bang theory will be able to enrich the dialectics with materialistic-atheistic cosmological theories. These theories interpret the Big Bang in the framework of materialist thought, which comes down to the conclusion of the infinity of nature, which has its latest form in the form of the Multiverse theory (Ijjas & Steinhardt, 2018, pp. 1-5). The dialectic of theism versus atheism continues to develop with an increasingly complex scientific approach (Boulding, 2021, pp. 1-20). The scientific approach can understand the scientific mechanism of natural origin, development, and its future (Barbosa, 2022, pp. 1-3). It can support the philosophical approach as the main approach in the



philosophical study of the principles of causality, order, and chaos.

The mechanism of the Big Bang theory can only be consistent based on the finiteness of nature. The Big Bang shows that regularity in its highest level during the early days of nature, and its levels decrease as nature develops and then decrease at the end of nature (Hawking, 2013, pp. 142-143). The theories of natural infinity certainly cannot understand the factual dynamics. The existence of natural development itself has shown that there is a process from the simplest form, which develops to a more complex form, and then ends with the highest level of chaos (Hawking, 2013, pp. 142-143). This nature is so far from stagnation. There was a time when nature was in its simplest form, namely singularity, and exploded on Planck scales. The situation does not have a simpler physical phase. Therefore, it is logical that nature has a finite beginning and age.

On the other hand, no law can replace the second law of thermodynamics. Chaos cannot be returned to regularity as it used to be. It shows the beginning and the end. If chaos can be returned, then time can be turned back. It certainly destroys causality and suffers from various paradoxes and contradictions.

Multiverse theories will not be able to explain regularity and chaos. That is because the principle of coincidence is used to explain the possibility that is not too unrealistic. The absence of purpose or confusion will nullify the existence of a systemic function and mechanism, so that regularity will not occur. It further shows the contradiction of infinity because it actually rejects the increasing chaos. This is because the increasing chaos will lead to an end that shows the limitation (Saputra, 2023, p. 191).

The cosmology of materialism-atheistic imagines a Multiverse which, without evidence, even the power of coherence is problematic (Saputra, 2023, p. 171). These theories violate various scientific facts, such as increasing chaos, the finite age of the universe, the early-late-process phase of nature, and so on. Furthermore, the arguments of atheism do not form a system or contradict each other. It can be found in the contradiction of infinite regress and Multiverse arguments. Multiverse theories deny the beginning of nature, let alone creation that involves the immaterial. Consequently, the argument of the infinity of immaterial causality also cannot be accommodated (Saputra, 2023, pp. 168-170).

These recommendations provide a solution to the problem of the gaps left by the cosmological and teleological arguments. The argument certainly contains many more loopholes because it will not be able to answer the question of the origin of nature, even though the theme of God's existence is closely related to the origin of nature (Saputra, 2020). Dialectic with atheism also involves the theme of the origin of nature (Linde, 2017, pp. 1-4).

## 4 Conclusion

Franz Magnis Suseno explained the cosmology and teleology arguments as natural arguments as well as giving criticism to atheism. Magnis does not really rely on these two arguments because there is a paradigm of no gap-free arguments. Magnis explains the cosmological argument by showing that this nature has the conditions to exist, changeable, conditioned due to its limitations, and created from nothing. Those things show the need for the Absolute and the invalidity of the infinity of causality. In the end, Magnis does not state that this Absolute is God.

The author's review of the cosmological argument is related to the paradigm that from the beginning states that no argument is absolute. It has an effect on the strength of the argument which has undergone quite a lot of fundamental evaluation. Another criticism is the lack of clarity of the deepest nature of causality, the lack of integration system between cosmology and teleology. Other gaps about the possibility of the immaterial causality of this natural cause as well as the absurdity that the Absolute is not necessarily God. On the other hand, the author affirms about the creation of nothing and appreciates the study of the arrangement of principles underlying causality. In addition, the author appreciates a more in-depth study of causality outside our universe.

Magnis examines teleological arguments about the existence of an overview of the fact of regularity in the origin of nature and the world of biology. This universe is so impossible, if explained by the principle of coincidence. On the other hand, it is also unrealistic, if you completely ignore the principle of coincidence.

It is still possible because there is still a possibility of countless other universes and our universe is only one of the designs among those universes. In the end, Magnis did not make teleology as an argument for the existence of God. Magnis only asserts that teleology is a strong guide to the believed God. The review of the argument is the inconsistency in the use of the principles of direction and coincidence, the lack of integration between the argument of teleology and cosmology, and lack of study of the fact of chaos and its position.

Recommendations from the author are based on the theory of the cosmo-teleology argument system and the theory of the criticism system of atheism. It includes a shift towards the paradigm that states that there is no absolute argument. Another recommendation in the form of the integration of cosmology and teleology arguments in the form of the limitation of causality frames order and chaos in the unity of the system. The use of more complex modern cosmology as an additional perspective and improved dialectics in the form of systemic criticism of atheism that is consistent with the argument for the existence of God.

These recommendations start from mapping various gaps in cosmology and teleology arguments. It is expected to provide an objective, Integral, and comprehensive reconstruction. The author avoids the step of leaving the problem of arguing about the existence of God, which is closely related to the question of the origin of nature. That is because the argument of God's existence is based on natural reasoning as a foundation for the view of the position of God, humans, and nature. The study is still relevant in this contemporary era because dialectics with atheism continue to this day. Dialectics with atheism also continues to occur in this contemporary era. In addition, divinity is a fundamental theme in the structure of the human worldview.

## References

- Bakker, A., & Zubair, A. C. (1990). *Metodologi Penelitian Filsafat*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Barbosa, J. (2022). Why Big Bang is so Accepted and Popular: Some Contributions of a Thematic Analysis. *Axiomathes*, 32(3), 433–458. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10516-021-09533-y>
- Boulding, J. (2021). *The Multiverse and Participatory Methaphysics*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Chan, M. H. (2019). Is the History of our Universe Finite? *Theology and Science*, 17(2), 248–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14746700.2019.1596314>
- Craig, W. L. (2016). *FIVE ARGUMENTS FOR GOD: The New Atheism and the Case for the Existence of God*. London: Christian Evidence Society.
- Hawking, S. (2013). *Sejarah Singkat Waktu*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Ijjas, A., & Steinhardt, P. J. (2018). Bouncing cosmology made simple. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 35. Retrieved from <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119270892>
- Khasri, M. R. K. (2023). *Status Ontologis Objek Semantik Ketuhanan dalam Perspektif Teori Objek Alexius Meinong*. Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.
- Kohli, I. S., & Haslam, M. C. (2015). Mathematical issues in eternal inflation. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 32(7), 075001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/32/7/075001>
- Kontou, E.-A., & Olum, K. D. (2021). Energy conditions allow eternal inflation. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2021(03), 097. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2021/03/097>
- Kreeft, P. (2008). *Because God Is Real*. San Fransisco: Ignatius Press.

Linde, A. (2017). A Brief History of the Multiverse. *Reports on Progress Physics*, 80(2).

Linford, D. (2022). Big Bounce or Double Bang? A Reply to Craig and Sinclair on the Interpretation of Bounce Cosmologies. *Erkenntnis*, 87(4), 1849–1871. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-020-00278-5>

Magnis-Suseno, F. (2006). *Menalar Tuhan*. Yogyakarta: PT Kanisius.

Sanchez-Sabate, R. (2021). Contemporary Grammars of Meaning Creation: Scientific Creationism and New Atheism. *Religions*, Vol. 12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12030166>

Saputra, G. (2020). Zakir Naik's Concept of Divinity-Cosmology: Criticim-Reconstruction of the Modern Natural - Cosmological Theology. *Teosofi: Jurnal Tasawwuf Dan Pemikiran Islam*, 10(2), 326–327.

Saputra, G. (2023). *Rekonstruksi Teori Sistem Argumen Kosmo-Teleologi dan Kritik Sistemik atas Ateisme*. UIN Sunan Ampel.