

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component (Religious and Philosophical Questions - Existence of God).

## Candidate 6

### Question 47

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**.

Although the point could be expressed more fully, the candidate was awarded 1 mark for the point that people will have different views because they follow different religions. The rest of the answer was awarded 2 marks as a developed point. After stating what people think God is like, the candidate pointed out that some people might ask how we can know if these qualities are true, or if omniscience or omnipresence make sense. The marks are not awarded for the KU of traditional views about God's qualities, but for what the candidate then did with them.

### Question 48 (a)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The candidate gives 3 key aspects of Aquinas's cosmological argument. 1 mark was awarded at 'every cause has a cause', a second mark was given for the idea that the universe must have a cause and the third mark was for the idea that only an eternal God could be that cause. An additional mark was awarded for the domino analogy which develops and further explains the opening point about cause and effect.

### Question 48 (b)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

The answer is not linked clearly enough with the argument, however it does include the idea of a chain of causes of a human being's existence, showing that the idea of cause and effect is true, so it was awarded 1 mark at the end.

### Question 49 (a)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

1 mark was awarded at "in mind" in line 5 with an additional 2 marks for developing the point further by adding that random events couldn't explain the complexity of the world, and that this could only be accounted for by a higher power. There is 1 mark for the example of the bucket orchid. There are no marks for Hume's counter-arguments because the question did not ask for criticisms.

### Question 49 (b)

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The candidate starts by giving a detailed description of the argument, but this does not answer the question so it is not awarded any marks. On first reading the next part of the answer seems to be straight KU of Hume's counter-arguments, however the comment 'showing Paley uses shaky logic' can be read as the candidate deploying Hume's views to offer their evaluation, so this point was awarded 2 marks. On the same basis the following point was awarded 2 marks at 'to do with religion'. An additional mark is awarded for their view that there is nothing to back up belief in an eternal God. In these kinds of questions it is fine to use arguments studied, but ideally the candidate should present them as their own arguments, or point out that they personally agree with a key thinker, eg 'I agree with Hume when he says ...'. This makes it easier for markers to discern the reasons behind their views.