



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

* 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
97 TOPIC 3	8
67 SECTION A	9
8 SECTION B	19.
Total	36.

This document consists of 16 printed pages.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

CANDIDATE
NAME

CENTRE
NUMBER

CANDIDATE
NUMBER

SYLLABUS

9	7	7	4
---	---	---	---

COMPONENT

0	2
---	---

SIGNATURE

--

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
TOPIC 3	
SECTION A	
SECTION B	
Total	

This document consists of 16 printed pages.



SECTION A PLANNING

Q1

FREE will debate

3 points/stages.

First - conception - Divine omnipotence

Hebrew 6-17

Jesus every remits us
remitted as we
and yet without
sinCAN'T DO THINGS THAT CONTRADICT - Renna
Scurry etc.(CAN'T TURN ~~MEANING~~ FORMATS OF WORDS
as a programme for action)

2nd Necessary connection between personality
& freedom, freedom is an essential element in
what we know as personal & distant from non-personal
life.
If no power of moral choice : No possibly any
No moral responsibility : Automaton. activity

B. Flew - Cos - Marriage

Mackie - possible to act well in
accordance -
necessarily. God didn't
God ≠ good or
all power

SMART - NEUTRAL everyone good
AUTOMATONS.

Hick - view of some machine

(Hypnotist analogy.

TOPIC 3 PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

SECTION A

7 (a) (i) Explain briefly the reasoning of the free-will Defence

The reasoning of the free-will defence is seen as necessary by many due to the evil observed in this world. Although we might use this to criticise the existence of God, instead the free will defence asserts that this is the construction of how things have to be, as in order to grant us the freedom to act on our own accord, we must also therefore have the freedom to act evilly, and in ~~doing~~^{arguing} so we can retain the conception of an omnibenevolent, omniscient, and omnipresent being.

(ii) Hick attempts to prove it is logically impossible for God to "have so made men that they would always freely do what is right" by laying his argument of the free-will defence into three defined stages. The first stage asserts that we must have a 'conception of divine omnipotence'.

God cannot do the logically impossible such as creating a four sided ~~square~~^{triangle} or a round square, showing that we can't turn a meaningless formula of words as a premise for action.

His second stage creates a 'necessary connection between personality and moral freedom'. This displays that freedom is an essential element in what we know as personal & distinct from non-personal life. He further

reasons that it is only through the presence of the many decision, we are able to make the "right" decision, after all if there is no power in our moral choice there is no moral responsibility, and so the choice of choosing 'rightly', creates a contradiction, thus not falling within the scope of the divine omnipotence."

Hick goes on the third stage where he acknowledges that this is where the discussion centres.

He admits that God can create a good being, like in a saint. Here ~~over~~ it is 'logically possible' for them to commit a sin, but morally impossible.

Similarly, for a filthy 'pervert', logically possible for them to act in good moral, but morally impossible.

It is here as well but he notes Hebrew 4:15, which states that Jesus himself was in 'every respect tempted as we are, yet without sin'. And so it is impossible to grant both freedom and perfection into the being's nature.

(b) There are two philosophers in particular, who Hick even chooses to acknowledge in his book that criticise Hick's defence of the free-will.

First is the philosopher ~~that~~ Flew, who argues, as the contrary movement implies, that it would be possible to retain freedom

and also for God to change our nature so that we act in better accordance with our environment. He chooses the marriage analogy to demonstrate his point. Although when a man marries a woman, those who know him best may be able to predict it, and the likelihood of a certain marriage occurring may be higher in accordance with his upbringing, he still retains the Liberty of Spontaneity, which he argues is the main definition of freedom, the freedom to act as we will, not as the nature of our conception may make us.

MacKie, also critical of Hork's free-will defense, criticises God further. Pushing on the fact that he sees no contradiction between freedom and bettering our nature. He concludes his analysis by saying that the possibility must have been known to God, and the reason he did not choose this was because he must not be either good or omnipotent.

However, Hork then acknowledges Smart's claims, where she agrees with Hork. She says that ~~reducing us to~~ making us all morally good automatons would create problems.

of neutrality. This would mean that there would be no morally right or wrong action, instead rendering the world pointless as it is free of compulsion, with nothing to combat.

This rebuttal can be seen as fitting of Hick's own views on the concept that the world we reside in is a 'veil of soul-making', where we are attempting to get nearer God's likeness by struggling against the odds, and acting in good moral standing. Finally one may draw a final rebuttal from Hick, where he analogises the concept of God making us all morally good into the Hypnotist ~~the~~ argument. Although God could make us all morally good, we would not be necessarily acting as we should, indeed our nature forced into a 'puppet' like state of harmlessness.

SECTION
B

'THE ONLY SUCCESS OF THE OA, IS THAT IT SUPPORTS THE FAITH OF THOSE WHO ALREADY BELIEVE IN GOD.' Critically assess this claim.

To first assess this claim, one must first comprehend what the Ontological Argument (OA) entails. It is an argument that attempts to prove the existence of God by saying that 'God exists', is an analytical statement. ~~However~~ Many philosophers have put their mind to this argument, notably Anselm, Gaunilo, Aquinas, then being reintroduced by Descartes which then was subsequently unfounded by Kant. More recently, Malcolm & Plantinga have introduced a more modern approach to the problem.

Primarily, Anselm defines God as 'That than which nothing greater can be conceived.' This is acknowledged even by the 'fool' in Psalm 14. Anselm believes that existing in mind and reality is better than existing in any one of these alone, and so the fact that God is 'That than which nothing greater can be conceived', an existing God is the greatest possible scenario, and so Anselm concludes that God must therefore exist.

Gaunilo, Anselm's contemporary at the time criticised this, in his reply titled 'On Behalf of the Fool', in this he explained that he could envisage the 'perfect' island, and consequently, as he could imagine the 'perfect' island, it must only be truly perfect if it exists in reality.

too. He went on to analyse what he had just said, remarking on the absurdity of such a statement.

Anselm rebutted this, saying that this difference in the statements was that islands are contingent. That they depend on other things and what embodies them. One can imagine an island not existing. It is because of the differing values of their existence, that they cannot be compared by the same argument.

Later Aquinas criticised this, rejecting the logical premises in the OA. In the criticism he pointed out that people do have differing beliefs in God, some believing he doesn't exist, even some believing he has a body. He argued that arguments had to come with experience, the concept of one coming up with an argument with no synthetic knowledge being absurd.

Descartes aimed to debase this argument by creating a slightly different take. In this, he reasons, that our knowledge of God is innate, that we all had this preconception of a supreme perfect being. Following this he further reasoned that to affirm all perfections, one of these perfections would

malcolm - God doesn't necessarily exist.

Pickings -
Multiple choice

9

→ Come into existence
or started
∴ God exists necessarily
not necessary
For Examiner's Use

Question
number

be existence, and thus to fulfil this concept of a supreme, perfect being, God would also have to exist. Descartes thought that existence was integrated into God's essence, just as having 3 angles adding up to 180° infers a triangle, it is required for the other.

If one acknowledges what Kant says to this to be valid, the OA then suffers a serious debasing.

In this he criticized Cartesian & Anselmian thought in wrongly assuming that existence is a predicate.

Establishing this he criticized their thought, saying that by saying that something exists, one does not add anything to the description of the thing. For example, if ^{a strange} ~~one~~ were to walk into a room, and say 'Cows exist', this would add nothing to our knowledge of them, as we already know this through experience. Conversely, if ~~one~~ a stranger were to walk into a room and say 'It exists', ~~not only~~ we would be left in the dark as to what 'It' was, and so the fact that 'It' exists would do nothing to our knowledge of the matter, we would need to know the ~~to~~ nature of 'It', for it to affect us.

He ~~also~~ reinforced his point by raising another criticism. He criticized these existential statements as he reasoned that they can only be synthetic, only made true or false by experience. The OA

claims that 'God' existing is analytic. However a unicorn necessarily having a single horn does not by any means imply existence. By this logic however 'God exists necessarily' means that he does exist, he exists necessarily, it does not bring God into existence.

Philosophers Plantinga and Malcolm have sought to introduce God through a more recent adaptation of the OA.

Plantinga uses a more complex approach, focusing on the possibility of God's existence. He reasons that if God exists in one of the multiple worlds there are (leading a theory from atheist Stephen Hawking), using his logic he asserts that if God resides in just one of these infinitely many worlds, he must reside in all of them as he is perfect.

One might criticise his logic saying instead that the existence of God is impossible. Furthermore one cannot prove that Mr. Hawking's theory of multiple worlds is correct.

Additionally, Malebranche reasons that there is a possibility God could come into existence, or that he has already existed, and as coming into existence would imply a flaw in his omnipresence, one would have to infer that God therefore necessarily exists.

One might criticise this modal logic, arguing that it is weak to assume that God exists through a probability, as there is no partial existing God, where a 'maybe' can be implied. It is a binary decision, he either does, or he doesn't. Perhaps this is why Malebranche resorted to a weaker maximality.

One might choose to criticise the OA by saying that 'the only success of the ontological argument is that it supports the faith of those who already believe in God'. It is true, that the OA does not summon God through logic, however, it is not a basis for theism, but instead lends it a rational acceptability.