

## Candidate 1 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>SECTION 1 -</p> <p>2,</p> <p>The cosmological argument is an argument in support of the God of Classical Theism. In this essay, I will aim to analyse and evaluate Aquinas' theory in seeing if it proves God's existence, as well as take developments and counterarguments into consideration.</p> <p>First developed by St. Thomas Aquinas, Aquinas gave three ways in his 'Summa Theologica' that aim to prove God's existence. Aquinas' first way involves motion. Aquinas rejected the notion of an infinite regress and stated that it is illogical. He believed all things were set in motion and that to go back in time, without the presence of a beginner would be incoherent. He argued that there must be an unmoved mover - God. This implies that everything in motion right now is occurring under God's will and is a cause and effect of God's 'first step' to begin the chain of motion. Many may argue for this first way to be invalid as Aquinas based his theory on incorrect Aristotelian physics. The discovery of inertia means that we no longer need to hypothesise an external force who is moving the universe and everything within. Inertia proves that a moving object will stay in motion even in the absence of a mover. This implies that Aquinas' theory is illogical as its very basis is built upon ancient physics which could not have been scientifically measured and proved.</p> <p>Aquinas' second way looks at causation. Similar to the first way, Aquinas rejected the idea of an infinite regress and stated that if one was to follow the chain of causation, one would have to reach an uncaused cause. This implies that the uncaused cause is God and that He is all-powerful as he possesses the ability to set a chain of causation under way. However, many may take Aquinas' second way to be invalid as Aquinas jumps to the notion that this first 'cause' is the omnibenevolent, omnipotent, omniscient God of Classical Theism. There is no proof for this. The first cause may be God, but He may be evil, or there may be multiple Gods. This implies that Aquinas is jumping to conclusions without having sufficient premises, overall weakening not just his second way but the entire argument as a whole.</p> <p>Aquinas' third way is based on contingency. Aquinas observed how everything in the universe is a contingency, meaning it relies on others for its existence. Because of this, Aquinas argued that at one time there must have been nothing existing at all. In order for the universe to come about, there must have been a necessary being which the chain of contingency follows back to. This necessary being is God for Aquinas, implying that God must exist at all times and is eternal as He does not rely on something else for His existence. However, this third way can be deemed invalid as one could argue that if God created us, there is no need for him to continue existing today. His creation can live on without His presence. This implies that perhaps God may have existed at one time, but is longer present. It further implies that perhaps God is not the God of classical theism as if he is no longer existing, then he cannot be eternal.</p> <p>Aquinas' arguments make a good case for the existence of God, however, fail to provide sufficient premises. I believe that Aquinas jumps to conclusions about the first mover or cause being the God of classical theism. I think it may not even be God, it could be a powerful entity, a malicious God, or none at all.</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>In the 11<sup>th</sup> century, Al-Ghazali developed his Kalam cosmological argument. Ghazali gave two basic premises -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everything that began to exist has a cause</li> <li>• The universe began to exist</li> <li>• Therefore, the universe must have a cause</li> </ul>	
	<p>Ghazali argued against contemporary Muslim scholars and philosophers in his book 'The Incoherence of Philosophers', such as Avicenna. Ghazali said that they had drifted away from Islamic teachings and that the universe having a cause is necessary. Ghazali, like Aquinas, rejected the notion of infinite regress and stated the universe must have had an origin point. This implies that Ghazali rejects the theory of an eternal universe and was attempting to incorporate his existing religious beliefs into the Kalam argument.</p> <p>In 1979, William Lane Craig developed the Kalam cosmological argument further and focused particularly on using proven scientific research to aid the argument. Additionally, Craig stated that the laws of nature did not exist before the universe and so implying that the universe came about through natural causes is illogical. Craig stated that because of this, there must have been a personal agency involved, an agency who is timeless, immaterial, and all-powerful. This implies that the agency must be God and that this God is external and detached from the universe. He does not need to comply with the laws of physics and exists independently. However, a weakness of Craig's argument is that Craig does not provide sufficient premises either, instead jumping to conclusions that an omnibenevolent, omniscient, and omnipotent God exists. The syllogism that Craig uses to base his argument off does not prove the existence of the God of classical theism, but rather an external entity.</p> <p>However, the eternal universe has been discredited by scientific research throughout history too, not just the cosmological argument. For instance, Albert Einstein's theory of relativity compared the universe to a balloon that is slowly expanding. This implies that just as a balloon is small and deflated at one point, on a cosmic scale, the universe may so too have been a small starting point which is ever-expanding. The most prominent scientific research is Edwin Hubble's discovery of red shift. Hubble observed how distant stars emit light and the further they are, the redder the light seems to be. This implies that the universe is expanding as those stars seem to be further away from others.</p> <p>In conclusion, the cosmological argument is a strong base to prove the existence of a creator. However, I believe it lacks in providing evidence that this creator is the God of classical theism. By jumping to such conclusions that are based on smaller premises, Aquinas and Craig fail to prove God's existence in my eyes. In terms of infinite regress, however, I believe the argument does well to disprove the notion. I think that Ghazali and Craig apply reason and logic and the additional scientific research too adds weight on to the evidence that the universe requires a cause. However, in overall proving the existence of God, I believe Aquinas' cosmological argument fails to do so.</p>	

## Candidate 2 evidence

<small>ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW</small>	<b>Do not type in this shaded box</b>	<small>DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN</small>
	<p>Section 1 - Philosophy of Religion</p> <p>2.</p> <p>The Cosmological argument is an argument first developed by Aristotle and then made famous by St Thomas Aquinas. The argument covers proving God's existence as the creator of the universe and all within. This essay will discuss the first three ways of Aquinas: motion, causation, and contingency, and will discuss counterarguments of people such as Anthony Kenny, David Hume, and Brian Davies. Ultimately, it will be argued that Aquinas's cosmological argument does not prove the existence of God.</p> <p>Aquinas developed the 'five ways,' of which he uses the first three to argue the existence of God as the creator of the universe. The first of his ways is motion. The argument from motion refers to the fact that everything in the universe moves physically, or changes over time. Aquinas argued that everything in the universe that moves is reliant on an external force, which he believes to be God. He noted that in the world, we can see things changing, or moving. This observation leads to wanting to draw a conclusion about how and why things manage to move. In his book, Summa Theologica, Aquinas states, "whatever moves is moved by another." This clearly implies that everything within the universe that moves is reliant on an external force to move. Additionally, this shows that something must be responsible for creating movement in the universe. Due to this necessary responsible being, the conclusion is drawn that God is the one who creates movement in the universe. In evaluation, I think that this is a somewhat convincing argument to make. This is because for those who believe in a creator such as God, it brings a straightforward explanation about how things move in the world. This creates a sense of wider understanding for people on earth about how their world functions. However, I do not think that this statement ultimately proves God's existence. This is because I think it lacks enough depth to be a full explanation for God's existence and power. I think that this statement from Aquinas is very broad, which makes the argument come across as less detailed. This lack of detail causes the argument from motion to seem like it jumps between points, and it makes the overall argument of Aquinas seem unfinished. Due to this overall feeling of missing points and it being quite a simple statement, I do not think that the argument from physical motion manages to reliably prove the existence of God.</p> <p>Furthermore, Aquinas discusses the idea of changes happening in the world. Change is referred to as alterations or adaptations that can be seen happening around us - for example, changing seasons or someones personality changing over time. To argue his point, Aquinas uses the example of fire and wood. This analogy is used to prove that something cannot change to become something else without it being done by something other. In this analogy, Aquinas discusses actuality versus potentiality. Actuality is the state that something is currently in and potentiality is the state that something has the capabilities to be in. In this argument, Aquinas states that wood is in its actual state, but has the potentiality to become hot by catching on fire. However, wood cannot catch on fire by itself, so the conclusion drawn is that something other has</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	<b>Do not type in this shaded box</b>	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>caused it to happen. As a consequence of this, Aquinas states that God is the reason for wood becoming hot, and changing into its potential state. I also think that this argument brings an explanation to those who feel they need an explanation for their universe and the changes they witness in it. However, I do not think it is a convincing argument. This is because it seems to ignore the fact that people have free will, and are capable of creating their own individual changes in their lives. Whilst it is true that people cannot control the weather, I think that it is invalid for Aquinas to claim that God is the one being who can make changes happen simply because people are perfectly capable of changing their own actions and bringing change about by themselves.</p> <p>Someone who has created points against Aquinas is Anthony Kenny. In his book 'The Five Ways,' Kenny discusses the argument from motion and Newton's first law - The Law of Inertia. Newton's first law is used by Kenny to argue against Aquinas's points, and to essentially disprove his arguments. The Law of Inertia states that an object can be in a state of rest, while having uniform motion. This means that an object could be still, while also having zero acceleration, which proves that an object can be in a state of rest, whilst having uniform motion. Kenny states that Newton's first law "wrecks the first way." This clearly implies that the argument from motion does not make enough of a compelling point to be unable to be disproven. Additionally, the use of Newton's first law in Kenny's argument proves that there has been significant scientific research into the topic of motion and how things move. This research is a reliable source for an argument such as this, which creates a more agreeable and easy to accept argument. I think that because science uses factual and physical evidence, it makes it easier to agree with than arguments that do not. This is because these types of arguments take well-researched information and apply them to their line of argument using the available evidence. This, in my opinion, creates a stronger argument than philosophical arguments. This is because science-based arguments are able to prove philosophical arguments - like the argument from motion - as unreliable arguments by just using the scientific research that is available. Overall, I think that the argument of Kenny is a more convincing argument against the existence of God than Aquinas's argument from motion is for the existence of God. This is simply due to the fact that Kenny makes use of famous, well-known, and widely understood research, which comes across as more reliable than Aquinas's overall argument.</p> <p>The second way of Aquinas is causation. The argument from causation refers to the idea that the world has a structured order, and there are logical steps that can be traced back to understand the true origin on the universe - God - and all within. In this portion of the cosmological argument, Aquinas clearly states that everything in the universe must be able to be traced back to an original cause. As a consequence of this, it is clear that Aquinas rejects the idea of infinity as he believes that everything has an origin that can be found and understood by tracing what we see today back to the beginning. In Summa Theologica, Aquinas states, "in the world of sensible things we find that there is an order of efficient causes." The first section of this claim clearly implies that the world is seen to be logical and well-structured. Additionally, this statement implies that there is a chain of events that has happened in the</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>world, and they can all be traced backwards to understand the original cause. Overall, it is clearly implied by Aquinas that the world is a structured and well ordered place, which has all stemmed from one original creator - God. In evaluation, I think that this is a valid argument to make. This is because thinking about the complexity of the origins of the universe makes it extremely difficult to understand what has happened in the past, making it harder to actually know who or what caused the universe to begin to exist. Additionally, I think that this argument brings a lot of closure to those who believe the universe to be created by God. This is because Aquinas makes a straightforward claim for people to follow, and the idea of there being a traceable number of events makes the concept of understanding the beginning of the universe less daunting. Whilst I think that the argument will make sense to many people, I do not think it is the most convincing. This is because I disagree with the idea that humans are capable of knowing what has happened throughout the entirety of the universe's existence. I think that making the claim that there is absolutely an origin and first cause for the universe is somewhat dismissive to many people's views, and I do not think it creates a clear enough answer about the topic. Overall, I do not think that the argument from causation is a very convincing argument for the existence of God. This is simply because it seems to be a dismissive viewpoint to take on the topic, and I do not think it accounts for alternative viewpoints, which makes the argument seem more closed with less room for discussion and expansion on the topic.</p> <p>Someone who argues against the argument from causation is David Hume. Hume claims that he feels there is no need to draw conclusions about what began the universe, as he feels like we as humans have no need to understand something as complex as this. Hume believes the world to have no specific timescale, and he states, "how can anything that exists from eternity have a cause?" This implies that the world is eternal, and there is physically no need to claim God as being the cause for the universe we see around us. Additionally, it implies that Hume disagrees with the concept of tracing back to the first event in the world. He clearly agrees with the idea of infinity, and thinks it is unnecessary to attempt to understand the world as something to have a cause. I think that this is a very easy argument to agree with. This is because Hume implies there is no need for human beings to understand the universe as being a product of God. This creates a very easy argument to agree with simply because his viewpoint is to just accept what we see around us, rather than attempting to search for answers about the universe. Overall, I think that Hume's ideas about dismissing God as being the first cause are more convincing than Aquinas's ideas of accepting God as the first cause. This is simply due to the fact that I personally see no need to attempt to find out what the universe stems from, so Hume's argument against causation aligns with me more than Aquinas's.</p> <p>The final factor is contingency. A contingency is something that may or may not have a reason for its existence, and is something that is reliant on an external cause for its current existence. Aquinas claims that the universe itself is a contingency. This is because Aquinas sees God as being external to the universe, and there is not a clear answer to why the universe exists. As a consequence, the universe is named as being a contingency. In Summa</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Theologica, Aquinas states, “if at one time there was nothin in existence, it would have been impossible for anything to have begun to exist.” This clearly implies that the universe had a beginning, and the beginning happened due to an eternal being who decided to create it. The idea of God being an external and eternal being aligns well with the God of Classical Theism, and this creates an argument that is easy to follow, with different points that link to other religious concepts. I think that the concept of the universe being a contingency makes sense. This is because there is not necesasrily one answer to why the universe exists as there are so many people who use their own judgement to create an answer. However, I disagree with the concept of the universe being reliant on an external force to function. This is because there is not a particular reason why the universe has to rely on God, which makes the argument seem lacking in that area simply because it does not reference the reason for accepting God as being the external force to make the universe function. Additionally, I think that the concept of the universe being reliant on another being ignores the idea of free will that is promoted in the Bible. By saying that the universe is reliant on an external force to maintain it and all within it, the idea of life having free will seems to be taken away.</p> <p>Finally, someone who argued against the cosmological argument as a whole was Brian Davies. Davies disagreed with the cosmological argument as he felt that it was lacking in certain areas, and he believed that it needs to have more depth in varying areas in order to become something that is easier to agree with. Davies stated in reference to the cosmological argument that “it by itself does not establish the existence of God with all of the qualities sometimes ascribed to him.” This clearly implies that Davies disagrees with the cosmological argument, and feels that it could become a stronger and more reliable argument if it focused on areas like how God maintains the universe rather than him just being creator. Additonally, it implies that the cosmological does not cover enough factors in order to be a fully convincing argument for the existence of God. Overall, I think that Davies argument is quite easy to agree with, and more convincing than Aquinas’s argument. I think that the cosmological argument does lack certain points in certain areas, and it would become more reliable if Aquinas focused on other characteristics about God rather tha only claiming him to be the creator.</p> <p>In conclusion, I do no think that the cosmological argument of St Thomas Aquinas proves the existence of God. This is simply because counterarguments like Anthony Kenny’s use of Newton’s first law, and David Humes dismissal of accepting God as a creator feel more reliable than the first three ways of St Thomas Aquinas.</p>	

## Candidate 3 evidence

1. The improbability of God is a debate which has spanned across thousands of years. The diversity of religions and beliefs on earth is incredibly vast, but the broader idea of a God and creator of the universe is almost believed by half of everyone alive. Many theologians and philosophers have debated the topic of God's existence, and the conclusion or answer to this question is still fiercely debated and questioned today. Atheist thinkers such as Marx, Kant and Antony Flew have created reasons and arguments against the probability of God, and this improbability can also be shown and proved through the relevant incoherence's of the general concept of God's qualities. In this essay, I will discuss Marx and Feuerbach's views on the forming of religion, I will discuss the largest incoherence's of God, and I will discuss the arguments and ideas of Antony flew when confronting the existence of God. Thus, in this essay I will argue for and against the improbability of God, however; I would predominantly agree with the statement that given the improbability of God, it is unlikely that God exists.

Feuerbach was a German philosopher who lived in the 1800's. He was an atheist, who believed that God is an illusion of what humans want to be and desire. Feuerbach is quoted reading "Whatever man desires most to be, he makes his God" and "whatever man needs, he makes God". This idea is interesting as it suggests that God is a human made concept, which is only dependant on era specific culture and lifestyle, as both what man wants to be and what man needs has surely changed and developed over hundreds of years. Feuerbach uses the examples of the Norse Gods to prove his point, arguing that as the Vikings were dependant on war, drinking and agriculture, the Norse Gods reflect these qualities of Viking culture leading to the belief in culture specific God's. Religious responses would strongly disagree to this idea, and would reply by insisting that there is no culture specific God, as a more general concept of God can be agreed on. Christian thinkers would insist that it is the Abrahamic God which is the only real and universal God. They would support this evidence by using religious texts and artefact's such as the Bible and gospels of Jesus' disciples. Feuerbach would reply against the notion of a universal or general concept of God, as because there have been so many differing religions and ideas of God, how can anyone religion definitely prove that their God is any more likely than others? Feuerbach would emphasise the improbability which this point shows, as if there are hundreds of differing concepts of God's, this makes the existence of one of these Gods significantly less likely the diversity of beliefs shows to great a disproportion in likelihood for anyone God. Consequently, God's and religions are human inventions which are built around general concepts of God's, but more specifically, the culture and needs of the subjects of their God. Marx would agree to Feuerbach's points against the likelihood of God, however Marx believes that God's improbability stems from a different source. Marx believes that religion is a tool used by the wealthiest in society to keep the impoverished oppressed. He explains this by evaluating that an impoverished individual may not try as hard to fight for what they want in the physical world, as they believe that if they are morally good, they will be rewarded immensely by the outcome of heaven. Marx believes this is a lie formulated and used by the government, and emphasises that

religion is the "opium of the people" as it allows people in horrid conditions to believe that their conditions aren't as bad as they are. Religion "numbs" the pain of poverty because heaven is so great, the physical world's poverty is just a blip in a perceived eternal happiness. Theists would disagree with Marx's views on a basis of principle. Religion and God's promote deontological ethics, which often are clear about what is moral and what is not. Religious responses would take issue with Marx's evaluation of religion, and suggest that people have a lot more to gain in believing in religion than not believing. This is shown by Pascal's wager, which is a formulaic layout of why believing in religion is the most pragmatic choice for humans. He believes that if religion is real and you follow religious moral standards, you will go to heaven. If religion is not real and you follow religious moral standards, you lose some human experiences. If religion is real and you don't follow religious standards, then you will go to hell. If religion is not real and you don't follow religious standards, nothing changes. Consequently, this shows that the most pragmatic choice to maximise happiness for a person would be to believe in religion and follow religious moral standards, as the outcome of heaven is worth the sacrifices of atheism or some human experiences. Subsequently, it follows that if you do not believe in religion and religion is real, you have everything to lose as the concept of hell is deeply disturbing and torturous. Therefore, I think that Pascal's wager does offer a strong argument into why people should believe in God due to probability, however; I feel that the arguments from Feuerbach and Marx do overcome the religious responses in favour of God and the idea of Pascal's wager. I think Marx would evaluate Pascal's wager to be harmful to people's perception of if God exists or not, as it lays out a simple inductive argument in the benefits of believing in God, without providing any real evidence which shows that heaven is real, hell is real, or in general any evidence which leads me to think that religion is any more probable because of the benefits which could reveal themselves after I die. Ultimately, I think that the points in favour of the improbability of God raised by Feuerbach and Marx do affirm my belief that it is unlikely that God exists as the explanation of culture specific Gods and government endorsed religion provides a stronger argument than religious responses.

The improbability of God can be analysed from differing angles and from differing ideas, however; the incoherence's of the classical (Abrahamic) concept of God strongly suggest the unlikelihood of a deity. An incoherence which has been debated for over a thousand years is the paradox of the heavy stone. The paradox is: Can God create a stone so heavy he cannot lift it? If yes, He lacks omnipotence as he cannot lift the stone. If no, He lacks omniscience as he cannot create the stone. Either answer fails to apply to the concept of God, so surely this strongly emphasises the unlikelihood of a God? Aquinas would argue no. Aquinas would draw the distinction between logical impossibilities and Gods abilities, and emphasise that the paradox isn't logically possible so therefore isn't applicable to a logically possible God. Aquinas uses the terminology of impossible to prove his point, and highlights that the logically impossible is nothing as if something is impossible it is cannot exist in the universe, as it is not possible. Consequently, if this is true that would count the paradox null as if it is not possible in our universe, how can we create a viable hypothetical is it isn't theoretically possible. Atheists would object to Aquinas' inference, and suggest that the fact that the aradox is logically impossible almost proves the atheistic point that the paradox is trying to prove. If the paradox is logically impossible, surely it follows that the agent in such an impossible paradox

would have to be impossible too? Religious views may concede that although the paradox is impossible, it doesn't imply or infer anything real about the status or nature of God – apart from the implication that God is limited to the theoretically possible. Non-religious arguments could perhaps look concede or understand the viewpoint of the religious argument, however; non-religious viewpoints would further affirm that the incoherence of the problem of evil is strong enough evidence to disprove any likelihood of God. The problem of evil is the logical issue which arises when combining attributes like omnipotence, Omni benevolence and the fact that evil exists. This argument can be illustrated by JL Mackie's inconsistent triangle or the simple argument from Theist and writer, CS Lewis. He wrote:

P1 – If God were all loving, He would wish for all his creatures to be perfectly happy.

P2 – If God were almighty, He would be able to do what He wished.

C1 – But the creatures are not happy.

C2 – Thus, God must lack either omnipotence or Omni benevolence as evil and suffering are not compatible with what God would wish the world to be.

This argument is deductive by nature, which strengthens CS Lewis' argument against the likelihood of God. Although, theists would argue two main replies to this argument: the need for contrast and the moral evil due to freewill. Religious advocates could argue that God creates evil in the world to create a contrast between good and bad, as how could we understand what is good without understanding what is bad? This point emphasises the theoretical balance which is kept in the universe, and emphasises that this balance of good and bad is created by God. On the other hand, Mackie would strongly disagree to this point as he would highlight that contrasts are only necessary for us to understand values, and that no God would fail to be able to understand or create good because of a lack of evil. Mackie would also show that as god is goodness Himself, this should emphasise His ability to create good without creating a contrast to understand how good the good is. A stronger religious argument which can support the likelihood of God is the argument that all evil stems from moral choice and freewill. This point emphasises that all evil in the world is caused by human choice, and the reason that God allows evil to continue due to human choice is because the gift and ability of freewill is such a great good, it overcomes the potential evil which can be caused by freewill. This is a strong point as it shows that evil is due to human choice, which consequently means that the evil we suffer is a reflection of the evil we put out in the world. This means that the immoral choices that we all make on a small level create a vast amount of evil in the world. However, Mackie would also confront this view with scepticism and he would evaluate that although large amount of evil can be attributed to human choice, an even larger amount of evil cannot. He analyses the impact of believing that all evil stems from freewill, and believes that if all evil stems from freewill and human choice, people can hypothetically make the morally good choice on every occasion. If this is possible, and every person did do this, Mackie still believes that there is evil in world which isn't caused by freewill as natural disasters, genetic disease an epidemics still ravage the world – whether it's people are morally good or not. This is explained and known as the evidential problem of evil, as the issue of the amount and distribution of evil is evidence enough to suggest that God is highly improbable or unlikely. Consequently, the evidential problem of evil cannot be

explained by religious arguments which draw emphasis to contrasts or freewill. Subsequently, the evidential problem of evil does imply that a God doesn't exist as the amount of evil in the world cannot be explained by religious arguments or justifications. Therefore, I agree with the non-religious arguments which prove the improbability of God as I believe that the evidential problem of evil cannot be overcome by religious responses or justifications. In addition, I believe that the evidential problem of evil does show that evil cannot all stem from freewill and moral choice, as natural disasters and disease are not (conventionally) caused by humans. I think the argument which implies God's limitations over the possible and impossible is reasonably strong, although I do agree more with Aquinas' reading of the problem and believe that as the paradox is logically impossible, it isn't completely applicable to what the conventional concept of God is. Ultimately, I agree with the belief that the evidential problem of evil does raise to high of an improbability of God to make His existence likely.

Antony Flew is an atheistic philosopher and non-religious advocate. He believed that atheism was deeply more complex than just the belief in no God, and Flew's work has provided other atheist thinkers to develop and strengthen their own beliefs through Flew's argument of the burden of proof and the invisible gardener. Flew created an analogy to explain how the atheist has to debate the theist, it goes as follows: two jungle explorers are walking through a jungle, when suddenly they find a clearing between all the trees. The clearing has flowers, and animals, and lacks weeds and harmful plants and bushes. The first explorer says "as this clearing is well kept and cared for, it must have a gardener" so both explorers waited to try meet the gardener. The second man said "We have waited for a day and no gardener has come, so surely there isn't a gardener but rather the clearing is natural". The first explorer replies, "no. there must be an invisible gardener who tends for this plot." In curiosity, the second explorer goes along with his companions' idea, so they set up an electric fence around the clearing and they find sniffer dogs to smell the presence of anyone who would enter. Both explorers wait a couple days to test their traps; however no traps were ever set off. The second explorer says "we have waited and waited and there is still no proof of any gardener existing." But the first explorer says confidently, "well, the gardener must be invisible, they must be void of smell and sense, and must be able to fly over or through the electric fence." This analogy of an invisible gardener is used to draw attention to how the concept of God is so vast, any theist can effectively use God to support their argument, because God's complexity and vastness of qualities and attributes is so extensive it can rebuttal almost any critique or argument. Flew uses this idea of an impossible goal to emphasise his belief about the burden of proof. The burden of proof is large in counting the existence of God as improbable. The burden of proof is essentially the idea that the provider of a theory should have to have to burden of proof to prove that their theory is correct, rather than starting at a conclusion and working back to justify why your conclusion is correct. On the other hand, religious beliefs around God are supported by holy books and historians, which have records of divinity of over two thousand years ago. Religious responses would believe that as the concept of God is so universal, the burden of proof should fall to the atheist in trying to prove that God couldn't exist, rather than religious views trying to prove that God does exist. Consequently, this shows how the burden of proof is debated between the atheists and theists, meaning that neither side can truly prove or disprove the existence of God as both sides of the argument put emphasis on

the other side having to provide stronger evidence. Subsequently, the atheistic response would meet the problem raised by the invisible gardener when trying to use scientific and philosophical evidence when disproving God, leading to a dis-transparency of what the actual goal of evidence for an atheist should be. Therefore, I would agree with the non-religious reading of the improbabilities of God which are raised by Antony Flew's proposition of the burden of proof as I think the religious responses fail to take accountability when accepting that the burden of proof does fall onto them. On the other hand, I can understand religious arguments supporting why the atheist should have to try to disprove God, as the holy books and gospels do provide some physical evidence which could support the existence of God. However ultimately, I do agree with the points of improbability provided by Antony Flew in proving that God is unlikely as I believe that the parable of the invisible gardener effectively shows how the theist can "skew the goalposts" when defending God's existence by using the vastness of scripture and divine attributes, which ultimately strengthens the improbability of God.

To conclude, I do believe that given the improbability of God, it is unlikely that God exists. I can come to this conclusion as the arguments of Feuerbach show that God is most likely a manmade construct, which cultures developed and created over time as to act as role models or perfect beings of these examples of culture. The religious argument against Feuerbach was weak, as it does not show a general concept of God makes any religions God's more or less likely. The religious argument against Marx was strong, as Pascal's wager does eloquently show how the benefits of believing in religion outweigh the consequences of if religion is real and you don't believe in it, however; Marx's rebuttal to this point on a basis of lack of evidence is strong enough to show that although the benefits of religion may be great, the unlikelihood of a God or heaven existing is deeply hypothetical and unlikely. The evidential problem of evil does show that the amount and distribution of evil in the world is so great that the improbability of God is almost ensured, as no almighty and all loving God would allow such vast amounts of suffering to exist and persist in the world. Finally, the burden of proof is a strong atheistic argument, and does amply show that the fact that the concept of God is so vast, the theist can respond to almost any critique by using God's attributes. I also think this argument is strong in overcoming religious responses as it shows how the burden of proof does lie with the theist, and the only physical proof being holy books and texts is not adequate evidence in suggesting a God who exists. Ultimately, this essay has shown that there is merit in some religious responses to the improbabilities of God, but that the atheist arguments which prove the improbability of God are too great for a theist to overcome. Consequently, I agree that the improbability of God does mean it is unlikely that a God exists.

## Candidate 4 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1)	<p>The concept of God is one that has been discussed for centuries, one of these main reasons why it is a widely discussed topic is because of the several different viewpoints that surround the matter. God is said to be omnipotent, omniscient and omnibenevolent - making him an 'omni-God'. Despite his divine characteristics, there are many who contend that it is unlikely that God exists. By looking at both the for and againsts of the improbability of God, this essay aims to explain the likelihood of Gods existence. The Euthyphro dilemma, Omniscience, Omnipotence, omnibenevolence and the concept of evil and suffering are all major parts of this essay.</p>

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

The Euthyphro dilemma is the concept that; ~~is~~ does God tell us to do things that are morally the right thing to do because He says so. Or are they the morally right thing to do because they are by nature moral. This concept is one which is widely discussed when discussing Omniscience. Omniscience is the divine attribute that God is all-knowing. That he knows right from wrong and that he is all knowledgeable. Surely, this dilemma should not exist if God is meant to be all knowing, he should know the morally right things to do. ~~the~~

William Lane Craig would say that this Euthyphro dilemma does not make sense as God's divine attributes should never be

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

undermined and that his nature is always 'good.' This is backed up by C.S. Lewis

The issue with omniscience and freewill is another widely discussed topic. If God is all knowing, surely it means we do not have free will as God knows what we are going to do before it happens then ~~the~~ it is not 'free will' it is Gods plan. In the bible it clearly suggests that God had a plan for us and that "before I knew you, I formed you." this again shows that the concept of God and his divine abilities is improbable. John Stuart Mill brings up the argument of, in a world where suffering is rife - why does God not try and stop it, he knows suffering is a big thing and still he turns a blind eye. J.S. Mill would say that the concept of God is not only incoherent, but that it leaves room for

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

an evil God.

~~Boethius~~ Boethius, a philosopher, says that this lack of free will we have due to God already knowing our future means that the concept of Heaven and Hell is skewed, it seems unfair for some people go to hell because ~~if~~ God knew what they were going to do and didn't stop it from happening with his Omnipotent and omnibenevolent self.

Aquinas would argue that God is only capable of knowing logical pieces of information - not information that doesn't align with his all-good / loving nature.

Some contend that God's concept of time is different from our own, that God sees our tomorrow as his

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

today and that he sees everything in a different time to us. God seemingly in this case is not able to contend what will happen in the future as he has not 'seen' it yet. ~~This concept~~ Boethius intended to add on to this concept by going a step further and saying God lives in an entirely different time frame / universe, that he is atemporal. This concept seems to not make sense as there is no evidence to back it up. Not only is it unscientific, it is not mentioned in the bible that this is the case. Again, this only backs up the claims of God's improbability

Overall, the concept of Omniscience ~~and~~ does not show God is coherent, instead it shows that we may lack freewill, as how can an all loving, all-powerful,

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

all knowing God let suffering be rife in the world. It just makes God look incompatible with free will, which I agree with.

The next concept that shows the incoherence and improbability of God's Omnipotence. Omnipotence is a divine attribute which means God is ~~all-powerful~~. ~~God has the power~~ There are two ways this concept can be taken; 1) God can do anything and everything 2) God can do anything logically possible. These options bring up questions like; Can God lie? Can God sin? Which are key things to keep in mind whilst looking at this topic of God's existence.

One way in which tries to debunk the concept of God's

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

Omnipotence is ~~the~~ the paradox of the stone. This is the concept that; Can God create a stone ~~that~~ ~~and he cannot lift?~~ so heavy, that even he cannot lift? If the answer is yes, then he is not all-powerful. If the answer is no, again he is not all-powerful. If God is capable of doing anything, lifting a heavy stone should be in his scope of practice. ~~It~~ This is just one of the many paradoxes which tries to prove God is not an omni-God.

Another paradox which is highly useful when looking at the likelihood of God's existence is the paradox of the squared circle. Can ~~God create~~ a circle - known for having one side and being totally smooth - be turned into a square - known for its four sides and being pointed? Well, if God is meant

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

to be omnipotent, by description he should be able to do it. However, it is physically and mathematic-ally impossible.

Thomas Aquinas ~~argues~~ believes that the Probability of God is 100% and that he exists. ~~Why~~ He aims to look around these Paradoxes by saying that they are illogical, so God cannot do it. He defines omnipotence as God's ability to do anything logically possible. Aquinas says that the Paradox of the Stone is impossible and that this dilemma is confusing. ~~and~~ To answer the Paradox of the Stone, Aquinas argues that God made the mathematical law, so why would God make something impossible to do. God cannot make a circle squared nor can he make a stone even he cannot lift.

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

The paradoxes are illogical / i) does not make sense.

To counterargue this, Descartes would argue that God can do both the logical and illogical. He can do anything. However, this creates a slippery slope of questioning God's ability to sin. If God can do anything, can he murder? Can he steal? If what Descartes says is true then by definition God can do all the above, which questions his status as a divine being.

~~Another reason God's divine powers may be diminished is because of the concept of evil and suffering. This last concept encompasses all three of the O's - Omnibenevolence being the most crucial in this case. In Christianity, there evil can be subdivided into 2 groups; Moral evil (murder, rape etc.) and~~

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

2) Natural evil (earthquakes, tsunamis)  
This evil that is so prominent in our  
world is being allowed

Overall, the concept of omnipotence  
is one that is very important  
when looking at ~~the~~ God's  
existence as it just proved again  
that the likelihood of God ~~to~~ existing  
is improbable due to a lack  
of both evidence and due to  
the fact he does not live up to  
his all-powerful status. Instead,  
he should perhaps be characterized  
as almighty instead of being  
able to do anything and  
everything.

Another reason God's divine  
powers may be diminished  
is because of the concept of  
evil and suffering. This last  
concept encompasses all of the  
other concepts discussed and

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

introduces a new divine attribute - Omnibenevolence. Evil can be subdivided into 2 groups; 1) moral evils (murder, rape etc) and 2) natural evil (earthquakes, tsunamis).

Surely, if God is meant to be 'Omni-God', God would want to eradicate all evil from the world, not let it keep progressively getting worse. If God is all powerful, he can stop all suffering and finally if he is all-knowing he should know about all the evils and those suffering from them. This line of thought belongs to Mackie, Mackie believes in an 'inconsistent triad' meaning that all these divine characteristics cannot all live together. If one doesn't exist or fails to make sense

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

It causes the collapse of all the characteristics.

Augustinian Theodicy believes that we deserve ~~the~~ suffering as we are the ones committing sins. That suffering is a way to try and punish us for our sins, which seems uncompassionate, especially if we are victims of an earthquake for example, and several innocent people are affected. To try and back up this proposition claim, Augustine says that Adam and Eve created original sin and that we as their descendants have inherited this 'sinful' behaviour. ~~However~~

However, this theodicy is very inconsistent and was brought together several ~~thousands~~ of years ago. Humans did not

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1.15 1.15 2.30	<p>descend from 2 people, it almost seems impossible and with the Augustinian theology they believe <del>that</del> in the homoculus theory, the theory that humans have little people inside them, which is not scientifically true whatsoever.</p>
	<p>The Irenaean <del>theory</del> <sup>theodicy</sup> seems to be the most probable. They contend that if someone commits a sin, that they learn from it and they can grow to align with God's plan. This theodicy does seem the most probable as it aligns with nowadays, for example someone who commits petty theft may not do it again.</p>
	<p>However, this creates a slippery slope on <del>the</del> what can God accept and what can't he</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p><del>if the</del> <del>idea</del> it questions God's moral compass.</p>	
<p>Overall, it seems like the concept of evil and suffering is one that is still spoken on till today and one that encompasses all three of the divine attributes. The Augustinian theory makes little to no sense in explaining the probability of God's existence because if God means to be almighty he should <del>already</del> know Adam and Eve were going to do what they did and should of discovered them to eat the fruit.</p>	
<p>The improbability of God seems likely as it suggests that God is not loving up for his</p>	

divine characteristics, and that he  
~~is~~ continue to his plan.  
The concept of omnipotence  
seems to be weak in explaining  
the concept that God does exist  
as a lot of the terms need  
defining. Overall, I believe after  
analysing, evaluating and synthesising  
the knowledge it is improbable that  
God does exist.

## Candidate 5 evidence

### Section 2 - Religious Experience

4.

There are many ideologies that attempt to account for religious experiences and the impact they have on individuals. One of these is sociology, and another is psychology. There have been many individuals to create explanations for religious experiences. This essay will discuss people such as Emile Durkheim, William James, and Bryan Wilson. Ultimately, it will be argued that sociological accounts are not the most effective factor in developing our understanding of religious experiences.

To begin, a key sociologist in the topic of understanding religious experience was Emile Durkheim. Durkheim had many ideas about the significance of religion to society, and how they both impact each other. He believed that religion is central to society, and that it always has been a collective experience. A key concept in Durkheim's arguments was the idea of 'Socialisation.' Socialisation was used as an umbrella to discuss how religion and religious ideas integrate into society. Socialisation includes the concept of social facts. Social facts are external ways of thinking, acting, and feeling, which can have some influence on individuals within society. As a consequence of social facts existing, people in different areas of the world and who follow different faiths may behave differently simply because of the social expectations of that group. Durkheim also referenced the long existence of religious ideas. He stated that "the believer has discovered from birth, ready fashioned, the beliefs and practices of their religious life." This clearly implies that those who follow certain faiths in their life will be born into a society where specific social norms will be followed, and will have been followed prior to them becoming part of the society. Additionally, it implies that religion has existed for a long enough time for behaviour to be integrated into the world that surrounds followers of that faith. Furthermore, Durkheim argued that religion constantly embeds social norms into society everywhere. He said that religion is the "progenitor of social institutions." This clearly implies that religion plays a huge role in furthering social standards into the world, and that it has always kept certain ideas at bay in the world. Overall I think that Durkheim's ideas are very relevant and effective in understanding religious experiences. I think that the idea of religion being a collective and shared experience is an interesting point to make, and it brings a unique perspective on accepting religious ideas in our

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>world. I also think that Durkheims ideas about religion being a key aspect of the behaviour that is seen in society is an effective point. This is because social norms are constantly becoming integrated into our society, and religions of all types hold different values. This variety of values and ideas about religion brings lots of opportunity for religion to play a huge role in social development and societal behaviour.</p> <p>However, there are others who have created explanations for religions experience by using other ideas and concepts. One person who has used psychology to account for religious experience is William James. James attempted to categorise religious experiences to understand mainly the impacts and effects it has on people. He divided his understanding into two parts: existential judgements, and value judgements. Existential judgements focus on understanding the cause of a religious experience, whereas value judgements focus on understanding the effects of a religious experience on an individual. James also noted four effects that an individual can experience. one of these is noetic quality. Noetic quality refers to the idea that during or after a religious experience, the recipient will have gained new knowledge about themselves or perhaps the world around them. There are some religious scriptures which reference religious experiences, and clearly link to the noted effect of noetic quality. In the Qua'ran, the story of the Prophet Muhammads first revelation is a key idea that links to William James's concept of noetic quality. In his first revelation, the Prophet experiences a visit from Angel Gabriel, where he is told about his upcoming responsibility as God's messenger. During this experience, Muhammad is told by Angel Gabriel to "Read in the name of your Lord who created." This clearly implies the importance of him accepting this responsibility, and it shows how the new information was presented to him in a vision-like religious experience. I think that this example is a really significant and relevant example to understanding how religious experiences can affect individuals. Additionally, I think that it provides a form of evidence to the claims made by William James about noetic quality. This is because even though this story will not be accepted and believed by everyone in the world, it still leaves an explanation available that supports William James's concept of noetic quality. Overall, I think that this idea is very effective in developing our understanding of religious experiences, and it seems more convincing than that of Durkheims. This is because it is shown how James perceived a religious experience to take place and how it effects an individual, whereas Durkheim does not necessarily use any specific examples, and rather just references the whole world.</p> <p>Another sociologist who attempted to account for religious experience was Bryan Wilson. Wilson's understanding of religious experience focused on religious experiences in the form of conversion. He noted that there are increasing rates of varying religious sects and things such as church houses. As a consequence of these opportunities increasing in numbers, more people tend to convert faiths due to feeling that their personal beliefs may be more catered to by religion than by society. Conversion can happen in many formats, and many people simply choose to as they feel that they will be more benefitted by following a faith than not. Alongside the increasing rates of religious sects, Wilson noted that people often feel that religious opportunities will fulfil people's happiness. For example, people may feel that they need a</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	<b>Do not type in this shaded box</b>	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>sense of community and a more relevant support system, so they may turn to religion to receive these things. I think that this makes sense, and is quite a relevant point. This is because people often seek out something that can benefit their life and positively impact the quality of it. Alongside these two facts, Wilson claimed that people can often have religious experiences and it leads them to convert to receive answers to specific philosophical questions. For example, religions often refer to the meaning of life or what happens after death in the main ideas of the faith. These opportunities being readily available for an individual can make it more preferable to convert as it will most likely bring answers to an individual who has been seeking them. In evaluation, I think that Wilson's claims are effective in developing an understanding of religious experience. This is because he discusses points that can cause people to convert, which develops the overall understanding of why people choose to convert faiths or belief systems. Additionally, I think that Wilson creates an effective argument because he uses examples about increasing rates of conversion and why people do so. Overall, I think that Wilson's argument is more effective than that of Durkheim's. This is because his argument has more specific focuses than Durkheim, which in my opinion, creates a more effective and convincing argument.</p> <p>However, I think that William James still has a more effective argument in developing our understanding of religious experience. This is because the story of the first revelation can be used to understand the actual effects that can be had on people who receive a religious experience. Alongside noetic quality, James's factor of ineffability can be discussed in reference to the story of the first revelation. Ineffability is the idea that during or after a religious experience, the individual who has received it will feel unable to properly describe their experience. For example, after the Prophet was told about his upcoming responsibility, he felt overwhelmed and shocked as he felt that he was unable to understand his experience with Angel Gabriel properly. As a consequence of this, it is clear that a religious experience can have a strong impact on an individual's mind and life. As a result of being a recipient of a religious experience, they may have to combat complex emotions and begin to understand themselves. In evaluation, I think that this argument is still more convincing than arguments arising from sociology. This is because, similarly to noetic quality, there is an example that can be used to understand the idea of James. Additionally, I think that the argument of Durkheim lacks enough explanation and specific or unique examples to be fully convincing.</p> <p>In conclusion, I do not think that sociological accounts of religious experience are the most effective arguments to develop an understanding of religious experiences. I think that William James has the most effective argument in developing understanding of religious experiences. This is because his individual portions of his arguments can be supported by specific religious examples, rather than generic assumptions about society that Durkheim's argument seems to revolve around.</p>	

## Candidate 6 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
5.	Meditative Experiences are a common
	in many Eastern religions.
	Meditation itself is the practice of
	calming the mind by focusing on
	an object or breathing in order
	to reduce stress and be more
	present in the moment. Meditation
	has been a practice adopted
	by as a way to relax and
	help with stress or anxiety but
	it is a practice that was
	originally developed for the purpose
	of becoming closer to <del>the</del> a
	supernatural presence or to
	achieve enlightenment, <del>and</del> <sup>or used for</sup> gaining
	a greater understanding of the
	universe and the true nature
	of reality. <del>Meditative</del> experiences
	can differ from more conventional
	Hinduism is a religion that
	frequently practices meditation and
	Hindus have meditative religious
	experiences. Hindus use yoga to

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>as a way of enclosing these meditative experiences. Yoga is series of body postures and <del>breathing exercises</del> controlled breathing. It is used as a tool to calm the <del>business</del> business of the mind and <del>the process</del> Hindus uses this <del>to</del> as a way to <del>achieve enlightenment</del>. Become close to Brahman and achieve enlightenment. <del>This</del> <del>Enlightenment is the idea that</del> Rudolph Otto was a <del>psychologist</del> philosopher who believed that religious experiences were about becoming aware of a numinous consciousness. This numinous concept is the idea that during a religious experience the individual has a sense of <del>knowing</del> knowing the holy. They feel a connection and understanding of the numinous. This does align with Hindu meditative experience as the idea</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>of enlightenment also involves this concept of knowing about the holy or in this case Brahman the Hindu God. An issue that arises from this however is that the Hindu idea of numerous would differ significantly from the Christian perspective of numerous, who believe in God as the heavenly father. <del>Both religions in</del> Both religious individuals experience this numinous presence but if <del>they</del> they are experiencing <del>different</del> or sensing a different kind of numinous then what does this mean? * I think <del>meditative</del> experiences help develop our understanding of religious experiences by <del>showing</del> <del>how</del> individuals can have conflicting or slightly different religious experiences. # I think this brings into question the validity of these experiences &amp; to an extent</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Since ~~both~~ If both ~~are~~ are genuine then they point to different realities. ~~But some~~ Some might argue that this ~~does~~ does not mean these experiences aren't genuine though.

The Center of Scientific and Religious Studies produced a list of key similarities between major religions of the world.

\* I think experiencing numinous consciousness in different religions is somewhat problematic since if ~~both~~ both are genuine then this means both religions are right however Christians don't believe in an idolatrous and the Hindu idea of God is very different to the Christian God so this would lead to a conflicting answer. On the other hand though one might argue that both still point to ~~the~~ the presence of an all powerful being and that's all









ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>Buddhists also have meditative religious experiences. They practice meditation often and believe in two types. Samatha meditation is about focusing on an object to quiet the mind and rid yourself of all thoughts. Vipassana meditation is about obtaining nirvana. Through these meditations Buddhist feel they can achieve enlightenment and discover the true nature of reality. Thoughts of hate and anger are replaced with feelings of love and compassion. However Buddhist <del>do</del> have meditative experiences but they are less centered around <del>the</del> the idea of a God or supernatural being. Buddhist don't meditate to become closer to a God or to know more about God's nature. This is a huge difference from most other religious experiences which</p>	



ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

impacts people ~~the~~ lives ~~be~~ God exists to an extent because of the impact He has on human existence. However Buddhist experiential may extend the idea saying that ~~belief is something~~ to any religious belief can have real effects. ~~Buddhism~~ ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~about~~ ~~God~~. This may mean that religious experiences are less about us actually interacting with a supernatural being or understanding the nature of reality but actually about the power of human belief. We can experience real ~~impact~~ ~~and~~ ~~positive~~ <sup>impact and</sup> positive effects from dedicated belief.

Buddha Shirdharma ~~is~~ had an important Buddhist figure who achieved Nirvana by meditation and ~~having~~ <sup>having</sup> a meditative religious experience. He also developed the middle way which was a





ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>act as proof <del>to</del> for the existence of God or the true nature of reality. <del>They</del> <del>remember</del> <del>Paraphrase</del> <del>of</del> <del>the</del> <del>same</del> <del>statements</del> <del>we</del> <del>should</del></p> <p>However this doesn't mean religious beliefs are wrong "it is the basic principle of credibility that we ought to believe things are as they seem until we have evidence we are mistaken" Richard Swinburne.</p> <p>This means since it <del>expresses</del> <del>are</del> have no evidence against these experiences &amp; being genuine - since they are individual so we therefore can't prove they didn't happen - we should believe them.</p> <p><del>You could argue people are being dishonest about their experiences</del> <del>but</del></p> <p>In conclusion meditation experiences are quite different from other religious experiences. They <del>do</del> <del>not</del> can involve a sense of humour</p>





## Candidate 7 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	Part B - medical ethics	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
7.	To what extent do you agree that organ allocation is not a moral issue?	
	<p>Our body is made up of organs. The heart, liver, kidneys, lungs ect. We need these organs for our body to function and keep our body healthy. However sometimes our organs get damaged and function to a lower standard which affects our health. This is when organ transplants can take place. These transplants can be done alive or dead depending on the organ. In the UK 7,500<sup>people</sup> are currently <sup>on the</sup> waiting list in search of</p>	

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

a transplant. With more waiting than organs available, and around 10% dying before they can even receive an organ, the process of allocating them can be hard.

In the UK specifically Scotland we have an opt out system which was put in place in 2021 by the Human Tissue Act 2006 (HTA). This was put in place to hope more organs would be available as people who don't want their organs taken from them can opt out. If someone then dies and hasn't opted out, their organs can be used to help save the life of another if suitable. This means there is more opportunity for lives to ~~when allocating the organ~~ be saved and people to live longer happier lives. I think

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	<p>this is beneficial as life is precious and we should always do the best we can with our resources. In the <del>UK</del> criteria must be met to ensure you are suitable for the donation such as no alcoholism, no illicit drug use, must be willing to take the immunosuppressants for life which are required and a healthy weight/lifestyle. If someone fails or doesn't meet the criteria, they are removed off the list until something has changed and they meet criteria. A moral issue raised by this is comes down to our rights. is it morally acceptable to be discriminated and be prevented of care due to any of the factors that</p>	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------



ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

rights apply when your personal choices to carry out bad things prevent you from having the opportunity to save your life.

For example, a Manchester football player, George Best, was an alcoholic. He received a liver transplant due to the damage of his alcoholism which never changed after the transplant as in 2002 after the transplant, 3 years after he died of alcoholism. This means this liver he had promised to take care of is no longer suitable to pass on and the transplant could have gone to someone who would have taken care of it.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>I think this further proves that <del>big</del> the moral issues of rights don't interfere with organ allocation as the best suitable candidate deserves to receive it.</p>
	<p>Another moral issue raised due to organ allocation is the cost it takes to carry out. Technology, data bases and tests as well as the surgery's its self are an extremely expensive way of helping <del>save</del> <sup>lives</sup> <del>lives</del>. Many argue the money put into organising organ allocation should be invested into matters such as cancer treatments. Utilitarians base their reason on what brings the most happiness. Therefore if some receiving an organ transplant makes the most happiness,</p>



## Candidate 8 evidence

8 Assisted dying is the purposeful act of ending your life, with the help of someone and with the help of medication. Dignitas in Switzerland is a assisted dying agency that help people either terminally ill or in too much suffering to die in dignity around friends and family. Assisted dying ~~is~~ encompasses many moral issues and it is a widely



ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

not include assisted dying. He is the one who creates life it is his right to choose when you die. In the bible, ~~an example~~ ~~of~~ one of the ten commandments is "you shall not kill." ~~together~~ This means yourself or other people and with assisted dying that even when administering the drugs yourself, you are still taking away a precious, sacred life according to God.

~~To~~ The Catholic churches view seems very uncompassionate considering God's omnibenevolent self. It seems as if they are taking away autonomy from someone, which doesn't seem right, especially when it comes to their own life. I do not agree with this -

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

moral issue as I believe that if someone is going through huge pain emotionally, mentally or physically they should be allowed to choose whether or not dying is the right option for them.

The utilitarian view would disagree that this is a moral issue, saying that they believe the greatest happiness and least suffering for the greatest amount of people is what matters. So, it ~~isn't~~ both family and person choosing to die are happy, then that is what matters.

I agree completely with this view, it should be about decisions, not about religion that cannot be proven. However, the issue

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

lies within the capacity of the one choosing assisted dying and if they have the capacity to choose for themselves.

Another moral issue is the question: does assisted dying mean there is no need for end-of-life care or palliative care.

Palliative care is ~~the~~ ~~the~~ taking care of someone near the end of their life. Whether this is holistically, physically or emotionally, end of life care aims to give safe-person-centred care. However, where the issues lie is whether palliative care is a choice or ~~or~~ ~~if~~ if assisted dying is encouraging people to end their lives.

The catholic church are major



ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

not seem fair that they are made to suffer longer than they would with assisted dying. It is just ~~just~~ prolonging pain and suffering.

The utilitarian belief would say that, yes, end of life care allows patients to say good-byes and pass away near friends and families. It does not provide sufficient pain management, and leaves people facing more suffering than what they would have ~~anyway~~ anyway (physical or mental).

I agree partly with both principles, I agree that it should be given as a pair, a non-biased judgement could then be made ~~to~~ to pick whichever either aligns with your religion or aligns with your

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>personal benefit. No one should be made to suffer for long periods of time as it seems unjustified.</p>	
<p>Another moral issue which is brought up is whether sanctity of life is more important than quality of life. The sanctity of life is the Catholic teaching that everyone is sacred and should be protected, whereas the quality of life is the principle that <del>it is</del> someone decides whether or not their life has enough quality to be justified as worthwhile or not.</p>	
<p>The Catholic church would say that the sanctity of life is by far more important than the quality of life as it is based on compassion and based</p>	

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

on the fact that we are all made "in the image of God, with a protected plan for our lives; "~~that~~ God created mankind in his own image." It reads in Genesis. This just means that ~~the~~ ~~right~~ ~~ought~~ ~~ought~~ dying should not be around so ~~long~~ ~~as~~ life is protected. God's plan for us should be cherished and life should not be taken so 'careless'.

In this case, I agree with the Catholic Church partly. I agree that the Catholic Church places a high value on life which seems highly compassionate. ~~However~~ <sup>however</sup> it is based on ~~the~~ the bible which was written before ~~sorted~~ ~~dying~~ ~~was~~ ~~a~~ ~~thing~~. It seems uncompassionate to allow someone to alleviate their suffering.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>With the quality of life, utilitarians and humanitarians would say that this is a better option of the two. It is not based on the bible. It is a subjective scale that one can use to determine whether they have a high quality of life or a low (life is not worth living) quality of life. Due to it being subjective, it allows for personal choices to be added into it which allows for great amount of happiness for the greater number.</p>	
<p>When looking at both the sanctity of life and quality of life it is clear that although the sanctity of life places a high value on life and doesn't treat people as if they are commodities, it lacks person-centred empathy. Why should someone believe in the</p>	

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTIONDO NOT  
WRITE IN  
THIS  
MARGIN

Sanctity of life if it isn't centered around what you want?

When looking at assisted dying and whether it is a moral issue or not. I believe it is not a moral issue. A moral issue is something that is by nature, wrong, which this isn't. If anything, I think assisted dying is compassionate especially when paired with the quality of life principle.

I think where it could become a slippery slope is when there ~~is~~ ~~an~~ choice is not given ~~between~~ ~~an~~ between end of life care and assisted dying. It cannot be given as a last resort because some may not align with it ~~religiously~~ religiously. Overall, I believe that although both sides of this

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

argument could show that  
it could be a moral  
issue, I believe that  
assisted dying is not a morally  
bad thing to go through  
with as long as you are  
well informed.

## Candidate 9 evidence

8	Assisted dying is described by the House of Lords as prescribing life ending medication to terminally ill, mentally competent adults after <del>passing</del> passing legal safeguards. Assisted dying is legal in many countries in Europe such as Switzerland, where it is provided by companies such as Dignitas, Belgium and The Netherlands. There are many moral issues that arise from assisted dying such as personal autonomy, the inherent value of life, and end of life care discussions.		
	One moral issue arising from assisted dying is personal autonomy. Throughout our lives we have <del>many</del> many opportunities to make decisions about what is in our best interest. It could be argued that denying assisted dying denies people the opportunity to make these decisions		



ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>important thing and individuals should have the right to decide when and how they die. I disagree with religious views on assisted dying as I think the quality of a life is more important than the quantity of life in general. I agree with <del>Preference</del> Preference utilitarian Peter Singer who believes dignity and agency should be prioritised when it comes to assisted dying.</p>
	<p>Another moral issue arising from assisted dying is whether or not life <del>is</del> <sup>is</sup> inherently valuable. Many religions, particularly <sup>Christianity and</sup> the Catholic Church believe in the sanctity of life and the inherent <del>value</del> value of all human life from the moment of conception. However, this is not a solely religious view. Immanuel Kant also believed that all life has inherent value. He believed no human should be seen as a <del>means</del> means to an end but should <del>be</del> always be treated as an end themselves. He believed the most</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>important thing was the preservation of human life above all else. However, many of <del>the</del> Kant's arguments discuss dignity and it could be argued that if a person's life is no longer dignified they should not be forced to live. It can also be questioned who should decide whether a life has value. Surely it should be up to the person living. I strongly agree that assisted dying is not a moral issue. I disagree with sanctity of life arguments as I believe it is wrong to insist a person continue living when they feel their life is undignified and without value. I agree with Peter Singer, who believes it is wrong to deny someone the right to end their life if they feel they are experiencing unbearable suffering and are living without dignity. This implies assisted dying should be legalized to allow people the right to make these decisions for themselves.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>Another moral issue arising from assisted dying is end of life care and who should have the final say over what is in the patient's best interest. Their doctors, the law, religious figures, their family, or the patient themselves? A notable case that sparked this kind of discussion was the case of Charlie Gard. He was born with a rare mitochondrial condition which meant he could not move or breathe on his own and he suffered severe brain damage. Great Ormond Street hospital where he was treated believed there was nothing more that could be done for him but his parents wanted to try an experimental treatment in America. Ultimately, the High Court, the Supreme Court, and the European Court all agreed with the hospital's decision and he died in 2017. When it comes to end of life care religious individuals such as</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>the catholic church preser palliative care options such as hospices. However, a consequence of this is there are rarely enough places in hospices for everyone who would benefit from them, meaning many people may still die without receiving this care. Non-religious individuals such as Peter Singer prioritise dignity and autonomy. A consequence of this stance is that individuals would be able to make their own decisions about what kind of end of life care they want to receive. This could be palliative care, medical care or assisted dying. I strongly agree that assisted dying is not a moral issue. I think it is important that individuals can make their own decisions about the care they want to receive at the end of their life.</p> <p>Overall, I strongly agree that assisted</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

dying itself is not a moral issue.  
I believe that an individual's dignity  
and personal autonomy should be  
respected above all else, allowing  
them to decide how they want  
their life to end.