

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

GCE Religious Studies 6RS04 1A

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2014

Publications Code UA039900

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

1. The question in AO1 says, 'Examine the argument and/or interpretation in the passage.'

All the level descriptors in the mark scheme for AO1 and AO2 begin with reference to the passage. There are many techniques which candidates used to demonstrate their understanding of the passage and examiners were alerted to this range in order to credit various methodologies. The essential point is that whatever approach was adopted the passage must be central and pivotal.

Some candidates presented a basic summary of the whole article, in this case Westphal, with only passing reference to the passage in the question. Where material was applicable, candidates were credited but in some cases the passage received only scant attention. In many other cases candidates used the passage as the focal point, analysing it further with reference to the overall article and this method, used correctly, may be seen as an example of good practice.

2. Candidates have improved in answering all the range of demands within AO2:

- Do you agree with the idea(s) expressed?
- Justify your point of view
- Discuss its implications for understanding religion and human experience.

In some cases candidates failed to address one or more of these requirements and presented partial answers and this was reflected on their level of achievement.

3. A feature of good practice was that most candidates made effective use of the synoptic requirements of this paper. In AO1 levels 3, 4 & 5 of the Mark Scheme there is reference to crediting answers that demonstrate the application of different elements of their course of study in this paper.

4. The question was divided into parts (a) and (b): AO1 and AO2 respectively. This was done to help candidates answer the whole question rather than bypassing elements within an assessment objective. Over the years most candidates have followed through the structure of the question but some have conflated these two parts and this has often affected the standard of the work where relevant material in AO2 has been omitted. Exceptionally, a few using this holistic approach have succeeded and produced good quality answers. There was some evidence that the quality of work was higher in AO1 compared to AO2.

5. A number of candidates developed commendable styles of writing including a commanding and confident tone with ownership of the text.

## **Question 1**

Good practice and areas for improvement

AO1 characteristics of good quality:

- well-informed answers focused on the passage
- comprehensive understanding of the passage
- reference to the article as a whole or to related ideas and managed effectively in order to demonstrate an understanding of the passage
- structured answers in a coherent manner.
- effective use of scholarship.
- AO2 characteristics of good quality:
- effective use of argument and sustained debate
- material related to other anthology sources and to relevant material in the other three units
- explicit attention to the implications for an understanding religion and human experience.

AO1 work that requires improvement:

- not focused on the passage in an explicit and systematic manner
- basic and too short in the analysis of key points and ideas
- a generic account of the whole article or a general account of related teachings at the expense of a focus on the passage in the question
- scattered references to the names of scholars but without further analysis of their work.

AO2 work that requires improvement:

- largely unsupported by evidence or argument
- limited explicit focus on the implications demands of the question.
- poor paragraphing techniques that restricted the quality of evaluation.

Observations from the scripts.

At standardisation meetings examiners were informed that it was not essential to examine every named philosopher or term in the passage, including Hegel.

Good quality answers displayed some of the following features:

- clear analysis of key terms such as scholastic and deistic movements
- issues related to the movement from philosophical theology to philosophy of religion
- analysis of relevant thinkers such as Kant, Hegel and Hume (noting that none of these were essential)
- reference to a range of philosophers within Westphal such as Schleiermacher, Marx and Nietzsche (noting that none of these were essential)
- thoughtful appraisals of the strengths and weaknesses of some philosophers compared to one another

- links and contrasts between reason and revelation
- synoptic material included a careful selection of relevant ideas such as arguments for the existence of God and religious experience.

The following scripts are examples of good practice.

The whole of this script displayed good practice. The substantial introduction presented a good understanding of the context of the ideas in this passage. The student showed an awareness of the philosophical style of Westphal's writing, in that he was presenting a narrative of a range of positions.

There was a commendable focus on the passage with a good understanding of a range of scholars and terms and ideas. The student was explicit in trying to show why Westphal was reasoning in certain ways.

AO2, although succinct, was a sound answer to all the demands of AO2.

Context - Enlightenment - foster MLU.  
 - post Kant + Hume criticisms - (Hegel sought to reconcile reason + revelation)

### PLAN

Intro - Theo / religion

Hegel (idealism -)

Explain SUIVOT + DEIST: no interference - Deism  
 faith + reason harmony - Aquinas

Recent discoveries of En. + science has answers → Deism more plausible.  
 + Mill - malevolent God → Deism.

Human reason availed - Kant - universal reason

• Explain Linnel

• Explain Hark: - how Kant + Schleier + Hegel got rid of it + why Hume + Mill REJECT it.

• life and death of Jesus - 'Myth of God incarnate' - Hill.

2) In his article, Westphal traces 'The emergence of modern philosophy of religion' from its roots in philosophical theology. Following the wake of Hume and Kant and their devastating blows to the classical arguments for the existence of God, Westphal interprets there to have been a 'shift' in philosophy from talking about God himself (theology) to focussing more on the realm of human experience and religious practice. This was largely down to the prevailing assumption of the Enlightenment that we cannot know God and therefore can only talk about religion (a notion that the idealist Hegel deplored). Westphal examines various philosophers involved in the post-Kantian reconstruction of the deist project, beginning with Kant himself and moving on to the romantic Schleiermacher and the anti-Romantic Hegel as they tried to salvage the rational 'kernel' of religion from the 'irrational husk' of revelation. ~~of which we~~

Although Westphal does not have a clear voice or argument in this article (as does A.J. Ayer and P. Benardete in their respective essays of the anthology), he threads together a clear narrative of the ideas of following the Enlightenment, including those who were more suspicious of religion and its motives such as Hume, Marx, Nietzsche and Kierkegaard.

In this particular passage, (relatively early on in the text) Westphal explores the two key areas of thought that 'formed the background to the movement that Hegel deplores' - Scholasticism and Deism.

Scholasticism is a form of philosophy that has been present since medieval times and is most prominently associated with Thomas Aquinas, who thought that faith and revelation could work together in harmony to establish transcendent truths about the divine. It draws its influence from Augustine, who thought that humans were born with 'original sin' and thus would never be able to know God purely through reason alone and requires intervention from the divine (through religious experiences etc. as alluded to in Donovan's article 'Can We Know God by Experience?') and requires faith in God.

However, the context of the enlightenment, with the development of ~~the~~ scientific method and discoveries by the likes of Isaac Newton gave rise to the ~~idea~~ concept of Deism. Put simply, Deism is the idea that God is separate from our world. He is transcendent and thus cannot intervene in earthly occurrences. The most we can establish about him is that he created the universe but, from that point onwards (dependent on ~~the strength~~ however strong a deist you are) he is <sup>not</sup> ~~is~~ either 'left' or is unable to communicate with us.

Thus this meant that the 'kernel' of religion would have to be separated from the irrational 'husk'. Westphal relies on this rustic analogy of the kernel and the husk throughout his essay. By 'kernel', he means the true core of religion that is beyond dispute whereas the 'husk' is often meant to mean unverifiable and questionable aspects of religion such as ~~faith~~, religious experiences, miracles, prayer and traditions that manage to separate religions and divide society - often leading to religious warfare and hostility - quite contrary to the 'moral unity' that enlightenment thinkers were desperate to foster. This, rather significantly, would include all things 'historically particular' associated with religion 'such as the life and death of Jesus', and thus much of the post-Kantian reconstruction of the deist project was much to do with 'demythologizing' the 'husk' of religion.

In the passage Westphal comments that the 'husk' of religion is that which 'exceeds the limits of faith, revelation and authority' - thus mentioning another key aspect of the aim of the enlightenment thinkers concerning the development of religion. They were concerned to establish a religion that could work in the 'age of reason' while also ~~fostering~~ preventing 'immoral hostility' between different faiths and denominations - the shadow of European



religious warfare 'hung heavy' over them (particularly the recent conflict between the Catholics and the Protestants) and therefore it would be necessary to establish a religion that would be accessible to all regardless of faith, social class or nationality.

~~The first part mentions the deist project~~

It is important to understand why deism and the 'shift' that Westphal emphasises happened. It was, in fact, the combined critiques of the Ontological Argument, Cosmological argument and Teleological argument <sup>by Kant and those</sup> that lead many to think that talk of God himself was impossible. Yet despite Immanuel Kant being a prominent critic, he was quick to establish his own argument for the existence of God and the afterlife and put forward what he thought to be the true religion. He had established in his critiques that <sup>neither</sup> pure a priori reasoning (as seen in the O.A) nor a posteriori reasoning (based on experience - used in the C.A and T.A) were sufficient so he turned to practical reasoning. His moral argument for the existence of God can be found in his 'Critique of Practical Reason'. He argued that since there is an objective moral law (accessible to all through reason) that requires us to do our duty for duty's sake alone in order to be moral and reach the 'Summum Bonum' (ultimate virtue and happiness), there must be a God to necessitate

this. This was because Kant worked with the modus operandi of 'ought implies can'. Just as if I ought to give my money to charity it implies that I can give money to charity, he thought that because we ought to reach the Summum Bonum we can reach it. Thus, because the Summum Bonum is evidently not achievable in this lifetime alone, then there would have to be eternal life and this would necessitate a God. This led to Kant's idea of God being 'useful, if necessary as an aid to human morality'. This is a very different idea of God to the previous scholastic ideas of the God of Classical Theism as one who communicates lovingly with his ~~and~~ creation. Kant saw this morality as the true kernel of religion and therefore organised religion that we are familiar with is unnecessary, in fact it is all part of the 'petite faith' as morality does not need religion.

There have been other ~~adaptions~~ interpretations of the 'kernel' of religion - not strictly deistic as Kant was, but definite followers of the movement that Kant established. These include Schleiermacher, who believed the kernel to be found in 'feeling' and experience of God, yet that organised religion can provide the concrete foundations for the believers to cling on to and Hegel, who thought that true religion that the 'absolute Geist' that we all share.

b) Dependent on which idea (scholasticism or deism) is in question, I have my own opinion, but I do agree with Westphal's narrative that the changing times of the Enlightenment led to the further development of Deism in the post-Kantian sense and that this has led to the society that we have today. Both ~~theories~~ 'species' of philosophical theology have implications for both religious and human experience, but most significant are the implications that Kant's reconstruction of the deist project would have.

Deism, in the sense that God is not immanent in the world but is transcendent and unable to communicate with us would not sit well with a lot of ~~theistic~~ religious teachings and beliefs - particularly within Christianity where the Bible is based on the experiences of others, the incarnation of Christ etc. Also, religious experiences would not be possible in a logical sense - giving rise to possible alternative explanations advocated by the likes of Dawkins and Freud as a 'psychological neurosis' and an illusion. This could have the possible implication for religious communities decreasing, the testimonies of famous mystics such as Teresa of Avila being discarded as meaningless (much to the ~~great~~ satisfaction of Ayer who would regard all of God talk as <sup>as</sup> 'nonsense' and a rise in atheism.

or agnosticism. For human experience, ~~societies~~ non-secular societies would have to reformulate much of their postures and encouragement of following ~~down~~ ethical theories such as 'divine command ethics' as they would be part of the irrational 'hurd' of religion from a Kantian deistic perspective (even though they do encourage the same principles as one would find using their reason, such a system would advocate clerical authority which was what Kant deplored). There ~~would~~ <sup>could</sup> be a rise in people looking towards more Aristotelian theories for moral guidance such as virtue ethics.

If the irrational 'hurd' were to be discarded (which, personally, I think would be impossible anyway) there could be a decrease in religious warfare as the divisions between faiths would be forgotten about. It could mean that people ~~now~~ would realize John Hick's theory of 'pluralism' which he demonstrates with his analogy of the blind men and the elephant.

(Each blind man represents a religion, they all touch different parts of the elephant i.e. the tail, the ear etc and therefore interpret their elephant to be a completely different animal (God) than the other man standing next to them when, in fact it is the same after all)

Faith schools would have to be abolished and would lead to what Dawkins dreams of - not 'labelling' and thus separating children from each other from birth

by injecting them with the 'virus of religion'.

~~However, the deistic perspective still does support~~

The idea that anything historically contingent would have to be discarded and demythologised would also have significant implications - resurrection, if believed in on the grounds that Christ was resurrected, would also be meaningless. This idea was advocated by Lessing and culminated in the rather controversial book by John Hick 'The myth of God incarnate' that tries to demythologise God into a moral role model as Kant saw him.

However, the deistic perspective does still give support to the idea of life after death which is a positive implication for religion and arguably, human experience as well.

From the Scholastic perspective, it has positive implications for religion such as that there being no need to give up faith in the face of science. In fact, many prominent scientists still hold out belief in God.

However, Scholasticism would still not break down the sometimes dangerous barriers between different religions that lead to religious extremism.

Personally, I agree more with a deistic view even though I am not religious myself.



This answer is included to show the variety of ways of achieving very good marks. This answer probes a number of key ideas and scholars intrinsic to an understanding of the passage. There was a good analysis of terms such as scholastic movements, and an astute exposition of key thinkers such as Kant, Scheiermacher and Hegel.

The AO2 answer is note-worthy in terms of its coherent line of reasoning in support of deism.

## Plan

AO1

Intro, Vostphal

define scholasticism + deism + explain deist movement

Aquinas - O.A

Kant - husk + kernel - moral argument

Schliermacher - Spinoza

AJ Ayer

Hegel + Kierkegaard

H + K + N + M.

- Consistently quote and explain in terms of  
Husk vs - Kernel

## Religious Experience

AO2

Religion - Deism + Pantheism + panentheism

- Scholasticism

- Degraded ethics

Human experience - Politics

- Social Attitudes

- Society

- Science + human progress

Morality - ?

of In Wegphal's extract, he tracks the philosophical and theological change from theology to philosophy about religion. Presenting it in the context of Hegel's dissatisfaction with this change, it is also noted that ironically Hegel's own 'lectures on the philosophy of Religion' ~~is~~ is a ~~key~~ key philosophical work that helps us to recognise this change. In this particular passage, the division of deism from mainstream religious theology is contrasted to its counterpart, scholasticism.

Scholasticism, essentially is the belief that faith and reason must work in conjunction if one is to gain an understanding ~~of~~ of God. A ~~notion~~ notion dating back to its most famous proponent, Thomas Aquinas, scholasticism during the time in which it was being developed could be seen as progressive - even leading to rebuttals ~~of~~ arguments in favour of God, Aquinas' rejection of the Ontological Argument comes from his belief that "we cannot know the essence of God" ~~we~~ ~~cannot~~ know as the 'Scholastic kiss of death'.

Over time however, the 'faith' aspect to scholasticism was received with growing criticism - particularly



during the enlightenment in which reason was beginning to take epistemic and philosophical precedence. Deism was a belief dubbed 'the Religion of the Enlightenment', and sought to bring belief into the realm of ~~only~~ reason alone. A dissatisfaction with historical conflict and the regressive influences of organised religion prompted a re-evaluation of belief, in the hope it would "foster moral unity" rather than immoral hostility".

Kant was a leading proponent in this enlightenment reformation. His belief in God stems from his philosophical examination of morality, and while he says religion is not needed for morality, morality would lead inevitably to religion. An afterlife is postulated in order to rationalise the success people achieve through immoral means, and so God essentially is the moral, universally applicable law accessible by all of us. From Kant's perspective, the "rational kernel" consists of the moral law, abandoning the ritualistic, \* and unnecessary aspects of a "petulant faith".

Schleiermacher, influenced heavily by the Dutch secularist, ~~the~~ humanist, and pantheist Baruch Spinoza, instead  
\* supernatural

decided that it was the feeling of God that was 'true' religion - with liturgical and ritualistic practices beneficial only to contingently mediate ~~the~~ this feeling and neither necessary nor sufficient for true belief. Schleiermacher claims that this 'feeling' (immediate and subjective, but recognisable) involves the experience of the spatio-temporal world through the universal connection of an infinite and eternal being. It is this connection that Schleiermacher states is the 'kernel' of religion, not morality.

Hegel, also sympathetic to the Spinozist form of pantheism, rejected both Kant's reduction of religion to morality (believing that a moral law was not far from the already prevalent dogma-based ethics of many churches) and also Schleiermacher's romantic idea of 'feeling' - as the appeal to immediacy could be held compatible with every "absurd belief and immoral practice". Hegelian Idealism, whilst notoriously difficult to grasp and impossible to explain fully in an exam situation, was like Spinozism in its pantheistic sense, hence when Spinoza states 'Deus sive natura', God or nature, Hegel replies "Gott oder Geist", God or spirit. Coupled with his dialectic notion of hypothesis, antithesis, synthesis, it is this progressive 'spirit' that God should be recognised as, in place of Schleiermacher's romanticism, Kant's moral rigorism and also

dogmatic, organised religions and sects.

While Hegel complained about the shift from theology to philosophy of religion, others simply complain about religion as a concept. Hume and others discussed whether the ~~big~~ problem may not lie with the kernel rather than the husk.

Hume believed that essentially religion was grounded in people's hopes and fears, and belief in God was essentially self-interest in trying to ~~not~~ improve their lives by appealing to, and living in accordance with the rules of a supreme being capable of anything. Others, like Marx principally, believed that religion exists in order to legitimise social structures of oppression, leading religious authority power over the majority, and convincing those at the bottom of this hierarchy that they will be rewarded when they die.

Kierkegaard, labelled a founding philosopher of Existentialism and also a Christian, criticised that the comparison of a society to Gods is ridiculous, pointing out the flaw in comparison between something finite to something infinite and eternal. He also acknowledges that religion is not more than to be an

active member of society - which he disagreed with. believing that compassion and the revolutionary aspect to Jesus is lost.

There are those who never acknowledge ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ any talk of God is inherently meaningless. A.J. Ayer, a logical positivist influenced heavily by Wittgenstein, applies his verification principle and deduces that if no empirical evidence or mechanism exists to prove God's existence or non-existence, then any talk of him is meaningless and your time would be better served doing something else.

5) The period finishing the Enlightenment did not involve a complete change to Deism, despite the efforts of its proponents. Religion is varied and popular, however the amount of global non-believers has risen dramatically, possibly indicating a growing dissatisfaction with the kernel, rather than the flesh, of religion.

The forms of Deism mentioned, as well as those influenced by Spinoza's pantheism, do certainly provide a more beneficial worldview than scripture and dogmatised, established, institutional religion. That being the exception with regards to his deontology, the

implications of a ~~the~~ universal deism seem to abandon all current notions of what it means to be religious. Hegel's dialectic would only encourage the progression of our 'geist', abandoning tradition that is regressive or out-dated. The immeasurable amount of fanatics who harm others and start wars through divine warrant would decrease drastically, as without scripture and superior knowledge, it would be much harder to justify acts of extremism.

The absence of Church teaching, while based on out-dated, historical scripture, would diminish the community aspect of religion, and although the Deist project aimed to 'foster moral unity', it may in fact reduce the moral unity that may have existed microcosmically within religious groups.

The absence of a singular, distinct God would allow people to become more tolerant of those they disagree with, allowing for peaceful, considered debate and problem-solving in politics and society. No religious bias would be given in democratic politics, and theocracies would be gradually abandoned offering the opportunity for a more egalitarian global society.

The impact on science would be tremendous. If no religious campaigns, religious ethics committees, or religious politicians stand in the way of scientific advancement in fields such as embryology, evolution, and cosmology.

Now, it is not the actual science that would be improved but social attitudes towards it. Deist values of rationalism, empiricism, and egalitarianism would encourage critical thinking and a global zeitgeist of scientific progression. Our own place in the universe is made much more insignificant without an Abrahamic God, and as consciousness may be raised enough to actually do something about it.

Whilst I agree wholeheartedly with Hume and Mose's theories about notions underlying religious belief, the abolition of religion entirely should not be advocated. Deism provides an alternative that is humanistic in its outlook, scientific in attitude, and egalitarian by nature. Religion will not go away quickly, people have shown that a need for religious belief may be more innate ~~is~~ in some than in others - and so Deism provides a progressive alternative in which to mediate the human need for spiritual

comfort. The Deist project of the Enlightenment, if it accedes to widespread support and belief in, provides the atheist and theist with a successful alternative.



This answer set the passage in a philosophical context. The candidate kept the issue of a movement from philosophical theology to philosophy of religion to the fore in the AO1 part.

There was good evidence of synoptic thinking as seen e.g. towards the end of AO1 in which the candidate referred to related ideas and writings about religious experience.

AO2 was a good example of an explicit answer to the implications of this passage.

1a) Westphal in this passage and in his article is arguing that there has been a significant change from philosophy about God to philosophy of religion. This change he discusses has come about due to the criticisms raised by Hegel on philosophy. Philosophy about God which existed prior to and during the 13<sup>th</sup> century was the belief in discussing the nature of God's existence rather than trying to prove God's existence. This was because many already believed God existed and did not need proof. At this time the church had a monopoly/ monopoly over the knowledge people received as many at the time could not read or write. The church therefore had a significant influence on the part of the two movements Westphal mentions in this passage. Scholasticism was the movement which believed in combining faith with reason in other words they "are harmonious and should be seen as holding together." A key philosopher who engaged in this movement was Aquinas who used scholasticism to produce his book "Summa Theologiae" with the intention of discussing the nature of God. Later on this was followed by scholastic attempts to challenge the arguments against the existence of God such as the Problem of evil. The main reason Westphal highlights that causes philosophy about God to change into philosophy of religion is a result of the dissatisfaction caused by the church's authority over the knowledge being received. This caused many to suddenly want to view religion as it was now seen as corrupt. This dissatisfaction resulted in what was also called philosophy about



God to change to philosophy of religion in the two movements periods known as the reformation of the church and the enlightenment periods. The reformation was a period where most wanted to move away from the church having the power.

Figures such as Martin Luther convinced people that religion should be centered only around "You, the Bible and God." Many found this convincing. The enlightenment period went in hand with this as new forms of knowledge emerged such as science which many were developing and changed religion. People could now read and write and questions emerged being radicalised ideas forward, including ideas from Newton and Copernicus.

These two periods led to Deism, the second movement. Hestipal highlights in the passage Deism was a movement which believed in separating faith from religion and use reason only.

The Deists believed that faith was all that was bad about religion corrupting minds. They also believed that you did not need faith to believe in God as reason provides enough proof.

Using the analogy which Hestipal uses in his article, the Deists saw reason as the kernel (the important part / feature) of religion and saw faith as the Husk (the outer case, insignificant aspect) of religion such as religious experience or the metaphysical. Another aspect key to the change from philosophy about God to philosophy of religion and the emergence of Deism which Hestipal mentions in this passage is the contribution of Hume and Kant and the two directions they take on the movement of Deism.

Hume 'who believed that because there was no evidence of God's existence, he probably doesn't exist' were in the direction known as 'suspicion of religion'. This direction included philosophers who questioned the motives of believers in religion. Hume himself believed that people only practiced religion / their faith in order to receive advantages such as eternal life for instance. Others in the direction (suspicion of religion) included Marx who believed that religion was an illusion centered around economics. Marx believed that religion was used in a selfish way and for selfish means, used by the rich to suppress the poor and used by the poor as a form of comfort in their suffering. Another example was Sigmund Freud who believed that religion was a "neurotic illness" caused by sexual repressed memories. Freud also believed that because religion was in the mind only it is not rational.

Kant however went in a different direction, <sup>a</sup> ~~an~~ <sup>as</sup> a theist, Kant believed in God, however he believed that because God is a transcendent metaphysical being, he therefore do not have the senses to experience him on a human level so there cannot be religious experiences of him or any metaphysical experience.

The direction Kant took with Deism was called the "Rationalization of Religion". This direction involved philosophers trying to reconstruct or reform religion using reason alone. As they believed it was the kernel of religion, Kant believed that religion should be a universal morality based on duty, morals and ethics. He believed it should be based and

focused more on the role of religion in society rather than the metaphysical.

Others in this direction however had slightly different beliefs.

Schleiermacher believed that religion should be based and more focused on "feeling God's existence" (such as religious experiences) as this he believed was the kernel of religion.

Schleiermacher believed the kernel of religion was organised religion as he believed this was only useful for believers to practise their faith and religion.

More modern forms of Schleiermachers view can be found in the views of Martin Zuber and Richard Swinburne who both

also believe that "feeling God's existence is the kernel of religion.

Martin Zuber believed the religious experiences provided personal knowledge and need way to support religious belief alike.

Richard Swinburne believed that religious experiences offered strong epistemic justification

for God's existence, after all why would a benevolent God not want to interact with his creation?

Swinburne valued religion experience as a rational approach to religion

and way to our grasp of a reality beyond physical experience.

In this passage Wesleyan is fundamentally arguing that

Wesley's views or contributions are framed around these

two movements which have resulted from the change from

philosophy about God to philosophy of religion and Wesleyan

is saying that philosophy about God no longer is significant because

Wesley is arguing that we have lost (and to some extent never)

have successfully argued so.

1b) I do agree with Westphal's argument that philosophy about God has fundamentally changed to being of religion as a result of the contributions of Deism and Hume and Kant. However I also believe that there are some aspects where philosophy about God is still dominant and faith is still very important in <sup>many people's</sup> ~~our lives~~. I justify this view based on the arguments for religious experience held by Zuber and Sunstein. Also to that category William James who argued that religious experience can be justified and even verified by judging the impact it has on the believer. I believe the religious experience argument is convincing and useful in arguing that faith and the metaphysical is still an important aspect of religion.

Secondly to justify my view is the belief that we can talk about God meaningfully using religious language. This is convincing faith with reason also and Ian Ramsey argues religious language is analogical and therefore useful as it illustrates the nature of God and allows us to talk about him meaningfully using analogy and without losing his divinity (avoiding anthropomorphism). In a similar way Wittgenstein in his later "philosophical investigations" also compares faith with reason arguing that religious language has its own distinguished language game with its own criteria and therefore makes discussing God meaningful for the believer.

In addition to this there are also many areas the church still has power over the knowledge people receive including the involvement of catholic schools run by the church in this country and the role of the Pope and the church. Both still have authority over the millions of christians in our world today.

Also there are areas such as the country where many laws and morals are based on the christian faith. If this faith is removed or based only on reason there is a belief that places would become immoral or intolerable.

I believe that if Nietzsche's view in this passage is completely correct, however it could have damaging or negative implications on society and human experience.

Firstly human experience would be based solely on ethics, morality and duty. We would always be suspicious of our actions questioning our motives. Furthermore, also human experience would only be based on reason without the input of the metaphysical and our knowledge would only or largely come from science and other radical ideas.

I also believe the implications for religion would be negative. The arguments for the existence of God would be ignored and irrelevant including the Design and Cosmological arguments which philosophers such as Aquinas argue is necessary for our understanding of God.

Also faith would become more humanistic based on morality rather than the metaphysical, therefore there would be no divine imperative to people's actions and beliefs.

churches, mosques and other places of worship for religious ~~practices~~ would change into moral support groups promoting duty and morality rather than practicing the faith which would mean that religious activities or religious worship in general would be irrelevant and useless for its purpose. Finally if the news of Khomeini were accurate and religion was sold or only practiced to gain advantages, many would have based their lives on corrupt lies. Going to church, receiving the sacraments would all be for corrupt means in order to gain rewards from God and would mean religion was selfish. More importantly those who have devoted their lives to religion such as priests and nuns would have done so falsely and even those who have died for their religion including saints, martyrs and people who have been oppressed would have done so in vain.

Finally if religion itself was completely fallen away and religion was based on <sup>human</sup> ~~vain~~ and <sup>non</sup> ~~religious~~ principles of ideas of religion, although the rich would not be able to oppress the poor, what would the poor turn to as a form of comfort of the metaphysical (religion experiences or religion was false or did not exist? This would take away the faith of many and leave them depressed or lost which I believe is a significantly negative implication of this on society and, religion and human experience. If religion did not exist or was false, perhaps it could end many wars in countries, however in my opinion it could also cause more

conflict in our world as many would find another way to demonstrate anger and frustration toward others or find another means of supremacy and oppression others. In my view religion is better than no religion at all, and religion should be concerned with reason, as well as faith, as this plays a very big role in many people's lives.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of good practice in structuring an answer. For example, the introduction to AO1 and its conclusion presented the key ideas and themes in a coherent manner.

The introduction to AO2 and its conclusion displayed a clear line of reasoning in support of deism.

a) Westphal's article describes the movement of philosophising from God to philosophising about religion. This was the enlightenment period. The reasons for this transition were that Hume and Kant made in depth criticisms of the classical arguments for the ~~the~~ existence of the God of classical theism.

This extract describes the two species of philosophical theology. The first being scholastic. This is where the ~~the~~ religious person uses faith and reason to backup their beliefs and views. One example of this is the Ontological argument.

The Ontological argument is based on the idea that due to the definition of God (i.e. omnipotent, omniscient and omnibenevolent) God must exist. Even atheists have knowledge of the definition of God, so they have to accept it. This can also be shown through Gaunilo's perfect island.

Another example of a scholastic argument is the Design argument. This is the argument that since the design of the universe must have been by God because there is no other possible reason. Also the universe has to have been designed because



because the world has so many distinct features working together that this could not have happened by chance. This is demonstrated by William Paley's Watch Analogy. The analogy goes like this; A man was walking upon a heath, he came across a pocket watch on the field. The watch must have been put there because there is no possibility that it could have been created by chance, all of its mechanical interior could not have been chance, it would have to have been engineered and then hand crafted. This is like the world. Aspects of the universe such as gravity, the distance from the sun, how the body works etc could not have ~~been~~ happened by chance. There must be a designer.

The second species of philosophical theology is Deism. This is religion based on reason. One example of this is Kantian Ethics. Deism was demolished by the critiques of Hume and Kant but Kant was the first philosopher to rescue Deism.

Kant's Kantian ethics is based on

the idea of duty, it is a deontological argument. It states that to make morally correct ~~decisions~~ decisions you need to use the categorical imperative and if the criteria doesn't match the needs then use the hypothetical imperative. The categorical imperative consisted of three sections. The first being formulae of the law of nature, the second being formula of the end itself and the first being formulae of the Kingdom of ends. The formulae of the end itself is concerned with the idea that you can't use humans as a means to an end, you have to respect people. The formulae of the Kingdom of ends is the idea that people should make their decisions as if they were a law making citizen of the Kingdom of ends. The moral decisions reached have to be universally applicable.

So the ~~philosophers~~ <sup>were</sup> arguments for the existence of God ~~were~~ <sup>were</sup> criticized hugely to the point where philosophers thought it would be best to ~~philosophise~~ <sup>philosophise</sup> about religion instead. A main reason for these critiques and the cause of the Age of enlightenment was due to the holy wars. Philosophers wanted unity in

religions and universally applicable and acceptable morals to prevent these wars from happening again.

The main critiques for the ontological argument is that it doesn't work because the statement ~~does not~~ is not verifiable (lacks empirical evidence). This is the critique of the verification principle. The verification principle consists of 3 ways to make a ~~the~~ statement meaningful. The first being it has to be analytic or for example 'All bachelors are unmarried men' this statement proves itself. The second being synthetic. This means that there is experience to back it up. And the third being ~~that~~ mathematical.

You could argue that the verification principle doesn't verify itself so this critique can be discounted.

If you looked at the critiques for the theories <sup>and arguments</sup> of religion reason you could argue that we were better off arguing for the existence of God.

In this passage Westphal talks about the kernel and husk of religion. The husk being anything miraculous and supernatural and the kernel being God.

Here Westphal is saying the kernel is the most important bit, but it could be argued that the husk is still as important. One example of a husk is religious experience. This is a religious encounter with the divine. William James gave the four <sup>components</sup> features of a religious experience <sup>the best described</sup> Immediacy, Noetic <sup>quality</sup>, Quality <sup>transcendent</sup>, and Passivity. Richard Swinburne argued the Principles of Testimony and the Principle of Credulity. These both basically say that we should trust people's encounters (testimony) and due to the pure content of ~~these~~ testimonies we should believe them.

Another form of religious experience is mysticism. This is where people actively seek religious experiences.

St. Teresa of Avila in 'The Autobiography' gave the stages of her religious experiences. The first being devotion of the heart, the second being devotion of peace (this is achieved through contemplation, the suffering of Christ), the second being devotion of peace (a steadfast peace from God), the third being a sense of union with the divine and the final being, capture.

So that as I have just explained a husk

it can be argued that the lack can prove the existence of God. ~~Even though~~ This is despite looking at the critiques such as Freud who claimed that people use religion as a psychological crutch and that religious experiences are an illusion of the divine.

b) The implications for religion if we based religion on reasons would be huge. An example of this would be that people would philosophise less about God and maybe people won't believe in God. ~~Because the base is gone.~~ Another implication would be that traditions, worship, religious art etc would be scrapped altogether.

The ~~critic~~ critique of religion by Karl Marx is that religion is just an excuse to impose a hierarchy. If this were true religion would have to be scrapped altogether as it is one big, fabricated lie.

If we were to go by the critique that religion is selfish as we just want to ensure we end up in heaven then all religious values would be abolished as it is all selfish. ~~The~~ People would

have to look for morals elsewhere.

One benefit of moving to philosophy for religion is that it would mean that all religions would unite. Mosques, Synagogues, Churches would become moral support groups and terrorism and extremism would be eradicated. Terror attacks such as 9/11 (Kush towers) would be avoided as religions would be more concerned with what's morally right.

Another implication of philosophy on religion is that ~~religion~~ being religions would be more concerned with <sup>people being</sup> rational decision making and this would have a positive impact on society.

I do believe though that it would be sad to see the backs of the classical arguments for the God of classical theism. Because of the abolishment of faith. Faith ~~over~~ is a beautiful thing and without it, the world would be a harsh place. What about love? You have faith in your partner so would that be ~~in~~ missing to? Humans, faith is a natural characteristic to humans and if God put it there in us to be programmed like that then we should use it.

Also, if we did move towards being

religion or reason then we would be cold hearted people. There would be no consideration of feelings, ~~intuition~~ intuition or faith in life.

It can be argued that the idea of religion should be scrapped all together. Sigmund Freud argued that people use religion as a psychological crutch for people struggling with life.

I do believe that if we used both faith and reason, using both the Koran and husk of religion, the world would be a better place. People would be careful of their actions because they respect and love God, they will also obey morally and do what is right for the God that they love. Surely this is a better situation than just using reason alone? We humans naturally have emotions so we can't just not allow for faith or personal relationships when making moral decisions or even living in every day life.

## **Paper Summary**

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are encouraged to:

- develop their interest in an academic study of religion
- develop study skills that reflect these academic demands such as thorough study of the texts, the ability to analyse complex ideas and to manage their material in order to answer the question in an explicit manner
- adopt a critical approach which reflects on their prior learning in the other RS units
- engage with the implications of their studies.



## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE