

Candidate 1 evidence

Section 1= philosophy of religion

3. a) what is meant by atheism.

Atheism is the belief that there is no God, instead of following a religion with God(s) atheism instead suggests that there is no God for multiple reasons. One of the first parts of atheism is the presumption of atheism which is the belief that some people have, they just assume atheism because they don't believe there is enough evidence for God, or simply because they don't believe in it, this has two parts. the first part is weak presumption of atheism, this is an argument from atheists that simply suggests, they believe there is no God. If a theist is the one suggesting there is a God, then it is the theists job to prove to the atheist why there is a God, they have no reason to justify their belief, as it is simply assumed that there is no God until proven otherwise. The second version, is strong presumption of atheism. this is where the atheist recognises that they don't believe in a God, a theist does, if a theist has to explain and justify why they believe in a God, a strong atheist will argue they have to justify why not. To do this justification there is often a number of paradoxes used in example, one being suffering and evil. God is said to be omnibenevolent, and omnipotent, but there is suffering and evil in the world. so why would an all powerful god let there be suffering to those who don't deserve it, and if God is all loving, why do terrible evil only happen to some people. simply, the belief is trying to show that if there is this God that is how described, as all loving and all powerful, how can both of those things be true if there is still suffering and evil within the world, they counteract each other in the case of suffering and evil which is an example many atheists may use to justify their beliefs. Another paradox used is the heaviest stone argument, if god is omnipotent, can he create a stone so heavy even he can't lift. if he can lift the stone, then it he can't create the heaviest stone and therefore is not omnipotent, however if he can't lift the stone, he is also not omnipotent.

examples like this are simply used by atheists so to explain why there is confusion and disagreement with the idea of a God.

b) The source suggests that, "there is nothing beyond the natural, physical world". This is Dawkins suggesting the atheist belief that there is nothing outwith what we know. An implication of this belief, is that it is not provable, there is no way to prove what we do not know, we simply have to explore and try and improve on the knowledge we do know. To suggest that there is nothing beyond our world has implications, as if you are religious and God created this natural world, then why are we to assume there aren't other of God's creation, but also, if the universe created itself coming from a non-religious view, then why is it wrong to assume that there are not other universes. To suggest there is nothing beyond the physical world appears naive as there is no way to suggest or prove otherwise with current evidence, there is no way to prove what we don't know.

"no supernatural creative intelligence lurking behind the observable universe" this belief has the consequence of it is suggesting there is no belief within religion, as it is suggesting no intelligent designer in any form. This has implications as Dawkins suggests, 'behind the observable universe' again, this causes issues as if it is unobservable to us, what proof is there that it does not exist. It is dismissing the idea of religion, without suggesting why such should be dismissed. This means that, in the source, Dawkins is claiming that there is no supernatural intelligence such as God, but is simply stating it without adding to his claim, which in some defences makes it on the same believability as religion. Alongside this the source also has implications as previously mentioned, it suggests behind our observable universe, if we cannot observe it how are we to suggest it as true or false.

'no soul that outlasts the body and no miracles', the source here is aiming to develop the belief as to why there is no God in support of atheism. But instead appears to simply be dismissing the evidence for God. This has the implications of it is not providing anything to the argument, as it is simply stating things people see as religious experiences and dismissing them entirely with no proof or reasoning. Another implication of this belief is the use of miracles, miracles have an undefined amount of varying definitions, so what may be a miracle to one person is entirely different from the other. So to use miracles as an example of why God doesn't exist, as the miracles are not caused by God, becomes confusing as there is no set definition of what makes it a miracle so the argument becomes ambiguous.

c) I believe that this source, does provide reason as to why an atheist may believe in such, as Dawkins goes on to suggest that the common examples of why God exists are untrue. While I agree with the source in that, there is no evidence of a God within what we can observe, within our science and modern knowledge there is no need for the bridge of connection that perhaps previously was necessary for knowledge to make sense. So in that sense I agree

with the source as i do believe it is important to simply work with what we know, we cannot comment on what we dont know outwith our world, but within it i agree there is no evidnece to suggest a god has to have or does exist. however, i disagree with the source as it goes on to imply that outwith our observable world there must be no god. i think this suggestion is unfair as even agreeing with the atheist source, i do not think it is fair to comment on anything outwith what we have evidence for, we have no evidnece to suggest anything about what is outwith our universe nevermind everything within it. so to suggest that a god or anything, could not exist outwith it, seems unfair as there is no evidence or sources to back up this information therefore i disagree with that part of the source. The source also goes on to claim that souls and miracles do not exist, i personally disagree with the comment on miracles. i believe miracles can mean different things to different people and it can be assumed that dawkins meant religious miracles, but i disagree with the dismissal of them entirely. this is because if somethinf extraordinary happens, whatever a person wishes to believe its cause to be is their belief but quite often particulary in modern miracles, the thing could plasuibly have happened or has proof of happening it is simply peoples beliefs that add the religion i personally do not agree with. i disagree with the soruce as i think miracles are too wide a range of instances to group together and dismiss entirely.

Candidate 2 evidence

Scientific accounts of religious experiences is the way different case studies and theories are reviewed in order to achieve a reasonable explanation for the different things people have seen or felt.

However many scientists disagree with religious experiences and believe there is

not enough evidence to back them up as there is no actual way to experience what they have experienced, instead they just put it down to mental illness or delusions.

Conversions can be scientifically studied as they can be physically seen and observed through different people in different religions, there must be some scientific explanation for conversions.

“neuroscientists claim that neuroscience contributes considerably in the process of understanding religious experience”. This shows that scientists do take religious experiences seriously instead of disregarding them like many people, instead they are trying to work out the reasoning behind them.

“neuroscience is able to measure brain activity during religious experiences”. This shows that there may actually be reasoning behind religious experiences, mentally or physically.

I think this source is useful as it attempts to understand the reasoning for these experiences, to try and help everyone who has experienced it.

A weakness is maybe science does not need to be brought in, I believe these people know they have experienced it, it does not need to be validated and they do not need science to try and tell them or get their point across to others.

Another weakness is brain measuring technologies are not going to see the miracle, they will track brain activities but it won't see what the person actually saw, is there actually any point in what they are doing?

Another weakness is they can only study conversions as they are the only ones that can be seen by the eye, I think miracles and mystical experiences are personal and would be incredibly difficult to study.

I think it is a good thing as it attempts to share reasoning to different people all over the world, they are raising awareness and giving hope to many by sharing these experiences.

Candidate 3 evidence

9. a) Organ procurement is when people die and they have organs able to be donated to others in need of a transplant. In the UK an opt out system is used to choose whether you would like your organs donated or not when you die. The organs are then donated to those most in urgent need of them (closest to dying). One person's organs is able to save up to 9 lives. It can become an issue when many people are in desperate need for an organ and issues such as age, substance abuse etc can all come into factor but it is meant to be who would not be able to live the longest without the organ. This then means a lot of organs get donated to older people rather than younger people as older people have weaker immune systems. The introduction of the opt out system has increased organ donation but many people don't discuss the circumstance with their family so then it isn't right to take organs from someone who might not have given the time to opt out. The family get the say of what they think their loved one would have wanted at the end of the day.

B) 'presumably people fail to donate only because of... mild doubts about their preferences' this shows that some people might not be donors because they aren't sure what organs they would donate and what organs they would want to keep as it can be quite a big decision for a lot of people. 'a slight distaste for considering the subject' this shows that some people don't like to think of themselves once they are no longer living and about what should be done with the organs they are currently using and the thought of them being out into someone else's body. It can be quite disturbing to think about getting cut open and if you are donating when you are alive you may be considering the effects that could have on your health or if the surgery didn't go well. The whole process of donating organs can be quite a daunting process. 'in this context it is possible that a relatively modest financial incentive would improve donation rates substantially' this shows that some people might be more inclined to donate organs if they thought they would receive money for their family after they pass or if they are donating organs they are able to donate when alive then they would be able to earn money from that it is possible it could increase donations as people like money.

C) 'presumably people fail to donate only because of mild doubts about their preferences' I think this could be true as once you are dead you have to think about if you would like any organs with you. This can also be related if your religious and you go somewhere else you have to consider if your organs are coming with you. Usually eyes and skin are more of a decision for people to make which I can understand as if I you are having an open casket funeral you would look unrecognisable without all of your organs. 'a slight distaste for considering the subject' I think it can be a strange conversation to have with loved ones as you are discussing a scenario where you are no longer alive which can often be too much to fathom as it is your life and your just not there anymore. I think many people wouldn't want to discuss it as they don't believe they would die anytime soon and I think a lot of people just don't like the thought of getting cut open and their organs removed which is perfectly reasonable thought to dislike. 'in this context it is possible that a relatively modest financial incentive would improve donation rates substantially' I think this would only be beneficial to some people especially if you are no longer

living once you donate most of you organs then money is not going to be something that particularly interests you unless you are leaving it to family. I think it could improve donation rates of blood perhaps as people do that whilst living in a donation but people would perhaps be more interested if they got paid for it.