



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

JBF.

18

* 4 2 3 3 3 8 8 2 6 6 *

SYLLABUS

9 7 7 4

COMPONENT

0 2

ANSWER BOOKLET

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS

Write your Centre Number, Candidate Number, Name, Syllabus / Component as written on your statement of entry, at the top of this page.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

DO **NOT** WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.

Use both sides of the paper.

Write the question number in the left-hand column provided on each page.

Use a ruler to draw a line across the page after each answer.

Write the numbers of the questions you answer in the order attempted in the left-hand column of the boxes on the right of this page.

Do all your rough work in this answer booklet and cross it through without making it illegible. Do not tear out any part of this booklet. All work must be handed in.

Check that you have written the information required on each additional booklet used and have attached them to this booklet.

Write here how many booklets you have used, including this one.

Question number	Mark
4 a	4
b	7
5	7
Total	18

This document consists of 16 printed pages.



Topic 2 / section A

Anthony Flew uses the principle of falsification to attack the idea that religious statements are meaningful, he does this by using the Parable of the Gardener. He sets out the scenario with two very different people, one who believes and one who doesn't. 'Some gardener must tend this plot, the other disagrees'.

This is a parable to show how beliefs work, with one side of the argument suggesting that 'there is no gardener'. Just like many people who ~~strong~~ are strongly skeptical about something, they are persistent, they need synthetic verification. The man who believes there is a gardener sets up servants to see if there actually is a gardener, to his surprise ~~both~~ no one is found and the 'invisible gardener' doesn't have any physical side to him.

~~this is~~ This religious statement is meaningful as there are two separate points of view and to understand what the man who doesn't believe there is a gardener, but nothing in his mind will change. Yet the skeptic seems to become ~~more~~ frustrated, showing that his skeptical view is hollow and that the fact the man ~~has~~ ~~does~~ at the end of the parable asks questions, 'how what you call an invisible, intangible'. This shows there is meaning behind the believers ~~claim~~ ~~that~~ there is no gardener. The claim that there was a gardener.

is eventually falsified and therefore meaningful.

not clear - ^ L3 - 4

(b)

Have can blicks

- has non-contingent lang
- Person who believes that they are out to kill
- Ayer / borderline
- ~~opinion~~

Have is a philosopher who believes that Ayer's article is wrong, he believes that Flew mistakes ~~religious~~ religious language to be cognitive when really it is non-cognitive. ~~The~~ The fact that ~~Flew feels that~~ Have feels that Flew believes that all religious language is beyond our own minds. ~~is wrong. Everything~~ Therefore that Flew says is meaningless.

There is a strong regard to the fact that Flew will use this falsification strategy to go against everything, and to prove that his statements are meaningful. The fact that his person who believes there is no god, does not explore the other point of view, he is so arrogant in his view, even though no synthetic proof is being revealed.

Have introduces the idea of a 'blick' which an example would be a person who believes that his teacher is out to kill him. Even when she/he claims that they would never do so, he would see this as a trick or a play to kill him. ~~This~~ State of mind is very dangerous meaning all your experiences and understanding of different situations show that you are

thoughts about the world are underlined by this huge idea that your teacher is going to kill.

This fits in with the ~~Menggenstang~~ Invisable gardener parable. The man who believes 'there is no gardener', is not open to understanding the reasons why this person is trying to prove this wrong. This is similar to the person who believes that his teacher is out to kill him. Both these thoughts are so concrete about their entirely different views. The fact that neither of the 'mad boy' or the person who does not believe there is a gardener, is that they are not susceptible to any other view. Beliefs are not tautologies. ~~According to Wittgenstein, they are~~

In conclusion we see that Hare's beliefs are useful when responding to Fum's attack as he shows that having a certain mentality and mind set when dealing with huge philosophical issues is wrong and therefore become meaningless. For a believer in religious language to come from beyond, but in reality to have, all language and understanding of ~~the world is meaningless~~ language and different interpretations are non-cognitive. Hare also gives us the view that different interpretations should be given as the belief or the mind set of the 'mad boy', becomes just one line of thought and very inclusive, ~~which~~ lastly the fact that Fum mis-interpreted the religious language shows that all his statements are meaningless. Sometimes obscure.

L4-7

Section B- (5)

5

Plan - non cog intro.

- Ayer / Ayer cognitive

- Have non-cog cognitive

- Hick - best city

→ verification - strong / weak

~~What is~~

is that of

A non cognitive view ~~that~~ ^{is that of} Ayer and many other philosophers stand by. The view that it is ~~is~~ simply within our minds, not beyond the strains of our human thought, feeling and other mindy issues. 'Good', is a phrase used in everyday language between many different language games. The word 'good' gives a positive feeling as if a sense of achievement has occurred. It is almost a word which ^{usually} means ~~the~~ ^{some thing} yet is it ~~long~~ a 'non cognitive statement'?

Ayer is a cognitive thinker, he ~~believes~~ is a positivist who believes in verification principles, which he explains in language truth and logic. ~~The view that good is non-cognitive~~ ~~to verify something and~~ To verify what is good is a starting place. It would be impossible to take a 'strong' verification ~~approach~~ task to try to ~~understand~~ ~~what~~ distinguish what good is, as it would take an infinite amount of times to work out synthetically just like the proposal 'all men are mortal'. The next task is a 'weak' verification principle, where by Ayer explains in purpose, what it probably would be, for example "It is probable that Columbus discovered America."

Question
number

Once establishing and verifying what good is, we then need to understand what context it is used in. Turning to Ludwig Wittgenstein and his different language games. The word good ~~is not~~ has only one particular meaning through out the different language games. It is not a word which is ambiguous such as 'John is right' - It could mean his political views being right wing or he was the answer correctly and accurately. ?

People who believe good in a non-cognitive sense and believe good is ~~not~~ created with in humans minds ~~but~~ ^{and not} by something beyond. for instance many people believe that God is good, many Christian believers would. Christian Catholics believe and interpret that God all derives from good, and they believe and recite this is a mythical way. Yet ~~these~~ many critics would talk about world disasters but God the Omnipotent, Omnipotent 'good' God does not recite this.

Different people have different meanings to words and use them in completely different contexts as Wittgenstein claimed but he also added that in order to understand language you have to join its language game

Lastly ~~the word~~ good ^{being a} 'non-cognitive' is a statement which can be seen from many different points of view. There is no real way of completely, synthetically verifying what 'good' is and where it comes and originates from. We understand there are two

points of view, one in which it is from our own mind and interest on it is beyond us. In the future there may be ways of verifying fully what is good, (which the concept of the argument comes from Hume). Good could be cognitive or non-cognitive as I have critically discussed. It depends what the nature of our beliefs are ~~whether the cognitive form of life is better than the non-cognitive form of life~~ whether we take a cognitive or non-cognitive form of life. Both these ways of life could be experienced in their own individual ways.

limited & covered.

L2

7