

# Candidate Marks Report

*Series : 6 2018*

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

---

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	H573
Candidate No :	Component Code :	01
Candidate Name :		

---

**Total Marks : 91 / 120**

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.  
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

<b>Paper:</b>	<b>H573/01</b>	
<b>Paper</b>	<b>91 / 120</b>	
<b>Total:</b>		
Question	Total / Max Mark	Used In Total
1AO1	NR / 16	
1AO2	NR / 24	
2AO1	13 / 16	✓
2AO2	19 / 24	✓
3AO1	10 / 16	✓
3AO2	15 / 24	✓
4AO1	14 / 16	✓
4AO2	20 / 24	✓

Question Part

1	
	<p> <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> Arguments based on observation are also known as the <sup>tele</sup>teleological argument; writers on this argument include Aquinas and William Paley. Hume wrote his criticisms of the teleological argument before Paley wrote his watchmaker argument, but his points can be used to criticise him nonetheless. Hume's argument, I find to be very successful as the <del>best</del> <sup>tele</sup>logical argument is <sup>one</sup> that is <del>not</del> <sup>rather</sup> illogical.         </p>
SEEN	<p>           William Paley argued God's existence could be observed through the complexity of our world - he gave the example of the eyeball - it's the eye is so wonderfully complex, we can deduce that there must be an intelligent designer as <sup>it functions so</sup> <del>it's so</del> perfectly <sup>perfectly</sup> <del>useful</del> for sight. He also gave the famous watchmaker analogy; imagine you are walking through a heath one day and you come across a watch, sitting on a <del>stone</del> <sup>rock</sup>. You can account for the <sup>rock</sup> stone's existence - perhaps it came about through a volcanic eruption, <sup>or</sup> <del>it</del> was corroded away by water. However, the <del>watch</del> <sup>watch</sup>, with its intricate gears and cogs, must have a designer - something of its complexity cannot come about through chance - it must have deliberate <sup>or</sup> <del>creation</del> creation. Likewise, our world is so beautifully complex and yet harmonious, <del>and</del> we can conclude the <sup>world</sup> <del>watch</del> must have its own 'watchmaker', this we call God.         </p>



Question Part

David Hume criticises <sup>indirectly,</sup> Paley's <sup>use of</sup> analogy, primarily. Hume argued that <sup>if</sup> it is not self-evident that everything has a 'maker'. If we were to come across a cabbage, we wouldn't conclude there had been a cabbage. Although, it could be argued that cabbages are more complex than what meets the eye, since when we examine it on a <sup>smaller</sup> more scale, complexities are revealed. Hume's most coherent criticism is of Paley's use of machinery in his analogy - many writers in Paley's time were using machines for analogy which Hume problematized. Using machinery as an analogy is deterministic; ~~or~~ writers who use such an analogy are inevitably going to reach their desired conclusion since machines are human-made. We can find machinery that suits our points and it also seems illogical to use machinery as evidence of God since they are <sup>human</sup> ~~not~~ - made - they aren't apart of God's natural world which Paley previously references with the eye.

Hume ~~also~~ <sup>also</sup> ~~no~~ <sup>also</sup> successfully criticized Aquinas' teleological argument; Aquinas believed <sup>we could see</sup> God's evidence <sup>of that everything</sup> ~~of~~ ~~in the~~ ~~cause~~ as given a driving force, a purpose or to use Aristotle's phrase, a 'telos', meaning 'end'. He gave the analogy of the arrow and the archer. If we were to see <sup>an</sup> arrow flying, we assume there has been an archer <sup>who</sup> sets its motion off.



Question Part

		<p>In this analogy as the archer, <del>the</del> God <del>gives his car</del>, setting the universe off on its motion towards its purpose, driving it. However, Hume criticised the idea that the jump that the argument takes, saying we cannot conclude that there is <sup>a God behind</sup> <del>is</del> the universe. It could have been a committee of Gods, or even demons or a stupid God, unaware of what he was creating. It's illogical to assume that this driving force is the Judeo-Christian <sup>God</sup> <del>return</del>. In the <sup>this argument</sup> modern era, though, it makes sense to put it in the context of science. Evolution suggests that there is no design, but the world is pure chance and the creation of species was a trial-and-error process of mutation and adaptation. Even if evolution was 'begun' by God, like F.R. Tennant and many other <sup>modern Christians</sup> suggest, it's an incredibly wasteful process with the <sup>extinction</sup> <del>loss</del> of many species.</p>
		<p>In conclusion, Hume successfully and competently criticises Paley's use of analogy and criticisms of analogy are generally hard to fault. However, it's worth considering the fact that Hume wrote in the 18<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries and to his criticism of Aquinas may be rightly outdated and more modern thinkers such as Bertrand Russell or Richard Dawkins offer better objections to the teleological argument.</p>
✓ 5	✓ 5	





Question Part

3	<p>Boethius was writing in around 300 B.C and wrote the famous text "Consolation of Philosophy" whilst in prison. In the book, he is visited by Lady Philosophy who guides him back to the true purpose of man - <del>release</del> <sup>striving</sup> - seeking through reason and thought. In short, Boethius didn't believe that divine eternity limited free will, <del>to say much thought</del> <sup>although his arguments for it</sup> as possessing free will is somewhat limited and simply isn't coherent <del>with</del> with the attributes he believes God possesses.</p> <p>Divine eternity is the notion that God is 'eternal', by this Boethius means God exists without beginning or end and isn't limited or constrained by human time. <del>He argued</del> <sup>he argued</sup> the God lived in the continual present and couldn't be affected or interact with <sup>human</sup> time. The notion of a continual present is a confusing one so Boethius gave the metaphor God on a 'lofty peak', and that from this peak, God could see everything; both the past, future and present all at once. Through this analogy, Boethius maintains God's omnipotence and omni<sup>science</sup> <del>power</del> but argued we still could have free will because God <del>is not</del> <sup>is not</sup> a puppeteer and doesn't force us to do anything, he <del>judge our actions from the lofty peak</del> <sup>ultimately</sup> we could still have choices but <del>they were all</del> <sup>God</sup> knew what we were going to do. However, <del>the</del> <sup>God's</sup> foreknowledge of God totally contradicts the notion of free will - that we <del>do</del> <sup>are</sup> free to do as we please. Boethius's notion of God as omniscient means we cannot have</p>
---	---

SEEN



Question Part

true free will. ~~Just because~~<sup>if</sup> God doesn't interfere, but knows everything that doesn't alter then we don't free will, as we're fated to act a certain way.

Richard Swinburne was critical of Boethius' atemporal (outside of time) God for being too cold and indifferent and ~~for~~<sup>for</sup> being too unlike the God of the Bible. However, an interfering God would ~~be~~ limit our free will even more; God becomes parentalised, and too familiar if he interferes. Nonetheless, ~~the~~<sup>the</sup> God of the Bible ~~references~~ does appear to interact with humanity; from sending the plagues to Egypt to help the Israelites, to ~~sending~~<sup>giving</sup> Moses the 10 commandments to sending Jesus, his son, to be the saviour of humanity. Most Christians would use Jesus' existence as evidence for a God within or time. Swinburne's idea of an 'everlasting God' is good for ~~the~~<sup>understanding</sup> a God who lives ~~eternally~~<sup>within time</sup>. Everlasting ~~suggests~~<sup>mean</sup> God does live in our time and can be affected by events but simply lives forever and doesn't impose on our free will ~~but~~<sup>but</sup> ~~some~~<sup>some</sup> merely occasionally guides humanity towards good.

Anselm <sup>proposes</sup> offers an interesting alternative to both Swinburne's God and Boethius'. He argues God ~~exists~~<sup>exists</sup> in the not on present, past and future and time exists entirely within God. ~~but~~<sup>the</sup> best way to visualise this is to imagine an invisible man in every room in every building of the world throughout history, ~~currently~~<sup>who is there</sup>



Question Part

currently, and will be there for the future as well. Similar to Boethius' God, he doesn't impose on our actions, merely knows what they will be. However, any foreknowledge conflicts with free will - if fate is predetermined then we cannot ever make decisions truly on our own accord.

Natural Theology is the most forgiving of the ones; it suggests God learns alongside us, he is affected by the ~~past~~ <sup>by the</sup> events of history and learns from humanity's actions. This implies we have total free will and can do as we please and that God learns from these decisions. However, for most theists, this theory anthropomorphizes God and ~~is~~ <sup>creates</sup> <sup>very</sup> the problem that Boethius intended to avoid - it undermines his omnipotence.

In conclusion, Boethius' theory is not <sup>justified with</sup> ~~conclusive~~ a God who cares for humanity and gives us free will - he is too focused on God's omnipotence and omniscience. Swinburne's theory is far more widely accepted in modern ~~the~~ <sup>Christianity</sup> - it ~~suggests~~ <sup>suggests</sup> a God similar to the <sup>God of</sup> ~~Bible~~ <sup>Bible</sup> and doesn't undermine either our free will or God's love of his creations. Boethius creates a God that is too cold and unloving to ever be a God humans would wish to believe in and there is simply no way to reconcile an atemporal God <sup>who</sup> ~~with~~ knows all and for humanity to possess free will.

✓ 4

✓ 4





Question Part

4) B) Corporate religious experiences are religious experiences that are felt by a group of people, a collective. Individual religious experiences are felt by the individual. William James <sup>argued</sup> ~~stated~~ he couldn't dismiss the significance of any experience but evaluating <sup>corporate</sup> ~~modern psychology~~ over individual experience is to consider the quality over <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ quantity. Ultimately, religious experience of any kind is difficult to consider meaningful or as evidence for a god but there are <sup>far</sup> ~~few~~ less explanations offered concerning corporate experiences.

William James <sup>argued</sup> there are four <sup>qualities</sup> ~~factors~~ of to identify religious experience; ineffability, noetic, transcendence and passivity. Corporate religious experience seems to especially contain noetic qualities) feeling of the divine, struck by <sup>a feeling</sup> ~~the~~ of something much larger than yourself, and also <sup>passivity</sup> ~~passive~~ - the most common corporate experience is "speaking in tongues", where you feeling 'possessed' by the Holy Spirit; ~~he~~ it 'enters' your body without ~~control~~ <sup>or</sup> you being aware of it. ~~The~~ <sup>A</sup> ~~most~~ <sup>well known</sup> ~~example~~ of the a corporate experience is the 'Toronto Blessing' - an airport Church where people claimed to have experienced the Holy Spirit/God which caused them to various things like 'Holy laughter' (uncontrollable laughter) or walk around on all fours and make animal noises. <sup>However</sup> ~~Modern~~, there is a well known phenomena of 'mass hysteria', often credited to ~~exp~~ <sup>exp</sup> ~~ain~~ <sup>ain</sup> corporate experiences. Things like laughter <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~



Question Part

often infectious and the human mind often copies and ~~non~~ mimics behavior <sup>subconsciously</sup> without. The consistency of the experiences of others around those in the Church could have easily inspired / triggered people to have their own experiences. James argued religion or God is often on the 'edges of the subconscious' of those who have religious experiences. Since the Toronto Blessing took place in a Church, the foundations of the experience were present in the minds of those who experienced it - if hallucinations were to occur, they would be presented in a religious context ~~rather~~ since the people were physically in a religion 'context'.

The main argument for the reliability of <sup>corporate</sup> religious experience is that multiple accounts and eye witnesses <sup>individuals</sup>. However, that doesn't dismiss the validity of the experiences. Richard Swinburne proposed the principle of credulity and testimony; if we experience something that feels 'divine', we've no reason to believe it isn't ~~that~~ unless we've good reason not to (credulity) and we <sup>should</sup> believe other experiences are genuine unless we've good reason not to (testimony). Swinburne doesn't necessarily agree <sup>religious</sup> the experiences are evidence of God but that they're <sup>genuine to</sup> ~~evidence~~ those who experience it. ~~Therefore~~ <sup>unless</sup> we've reason not to, we should believe that an individual's experience is a reliable account. A famous example of an individual's experience would be St Teresa of Avila, who

SEEN



Question Part

claimed to have experienced Jesus on multiple ~~or~~ occasions.

Although ~~however~~, Swinburne proposes we should believe somebody unless ~~we have a good reason not to~~ we've good reason not to; so the multiple explanations ~~offered~~ offered by psychologists and theologians ~~and philosophers~~ should be reason enough not to. In the case of St Teresa - she was inclined to self-mortification (self punishment as evidence of your faith and devotion to God) and it's not unreasonable to assume that this took its toll on her mental state until she became so ill she had hallucinations. ~~Further more~~ ~~then~~ the reliability of any religious experience can be questioned since people lie - the privacy of the mind makes it difficult to understand what a person has actually experienced or whether they ~~truly~~ truly did at all. Sigmund Freud ~~has~~ believed all religious experiences can be dismissed as 'infantile neurosis' - people projecting ~~projecting~~ their need of a parental figure into a ~~deity~~ deity God because they are unable to cope with adult life.

In conclusion, based on the amount of accounts of the experience and the amount of eyewitnesses, of corporate experiences, ~~seem~~ they can be considered a more reliable than individual experiences, which ~~often~~ ~~had~~ happen alone so there are no eyewitnesses. However, their genuineness can be considered ~~the same~~ <sup>relatively</sup> the same - both experiences ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> genuine to who experienced, but ~~not~~ made up accounts are more likely to occur when

SEEN



Question Part

		it's an individual's experience. However, <del>Fund</del> <sup>Jays</sup>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6		off offers the most conclusive argument - neither
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	one evidence of a god but both share the same
		qualities.

