



Pearson

Examiners' Report  
June 2017

GCE Religious Studies 8RS0 01

## 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 2017

Publications Code 8RS0\_01\_1706\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## Introduction

This was the first sitting of the New Specification and there were some commendable responses with some excellent ones. Generally, pupils were very successful. This format allowed students to demonstrate a wider range of skills with the longer and shorter responses. Faced with a new specification, with different assessment criteria, students and teachers have risen to the challenge. It was a privilege to read the scripts and be privy to the hard work that has taken place throughout the year in schools across the country.

However, it appears some centres did not manage to cover the whole Specification, or at least students did not in their revision, which clearly disadvantaged those candidates. There were a large number of questions left blank, notably in relation to the Process theodicy question. This topic is clearly on the Specification (3.2 (c)) and no sections of the Specification are optional.

Candidates seemed to be getting to grips with the trigger words and the best answers did 'assess' in the Assess questions (q's 2 and 3) weighing up the strength of, or reasons for, a position, and forming a conclusion – employing the AO2 skill as required by these questions and indicated on the SAMs. There were a good number of responses however that failed to assess the question adequately. Many candidates did an excellent job in the straightforward AO1 'Explore' questions and gave full, succinct responses. Some candidates were tempted to include strengths and weaknesses or analysis here but this was not required; material was credited where relevant of course, but often this element of the response took time and content away from material that would have been more directly relevant. The key to success in these questions is writing material that directly focuses on the issue of the question only, without including any extra tangential material to detract from the time and task available. It is certainly not necessary to write extra material to reach the top levels in these questions.

The 'big essay' in q4 was tackled well by the majority of students although there were some rather short responses – candidates should be mindful of the number of marks available for this section of the paper and try to plan their time accordingly. It is also prudent to take care not to repeat material from a) in b) and to instead target material to the specific demands of each of the questions. The best responses in 4 b) tackled the issue of whether the argument fails to prove the existence of God or not, with good use of detailed argument, counter argument, clear and accurate use of scholarship and direct evaluation of the issue and a clear conclusion reached.

## Question 1

Explore key ideas about the existence of God in the Ontological Argument. (8)

Some students worked systematically through the views of Anselm (although surprisingly not many were able to be accurate about his definition of God as 'that than which nothing greater can be conceived') Descartes and one modern thinker; others concentrated on Anselm unpacking key ideas there and either approach saw success. There was good use of technical terms in many answers such as 'in intellectu' and 'in re' which was pleasing. Gaunilo's view was often used but not always then linked into key ideas about the nature of existence. Excellent responses in a page covered the nature of existence in Anselm's two forms, Descartes' re-minting and even Malcolm's or Plantinga's modern reformulations. They were outstanding in their succinctness and precision of language with a clear focus on the ideas about the existence of God. Weaker responses spent too much time on narrative or irrelevant detail which was a pity as sharper focus on the question could have led to higher marks. Some responses revealed candidates were confused between the Ontological and Cosmological arguments.

Many students took this to be a question about key ideas of the Ontological argument and so spent a lot of time on its nature as an a priori deductive argument rather than focusing on the key ideas about the existence of God that the question had asked for.

### SECTION A

**Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.**

1 Explore key ideas about the existence of God in the Ontological Argument.

Firstly the main argument is from Anselm, in his argument he stated that "God is that than which nothing greater can be conceived", "it is better to exist in reality than to exist in just the mind only, if God only existed in the mind he would not be that than which nothing greater can be conceived" - therefore God exists in reality. Gaunilo agrees against Anselm saying that his argument is absurd - he uses a red herring and abundance to prove the argument to be flawed. To explain this he uses the perfect island theory, he states the perfect island is "that than which no greater can be conceived, hence it better to exist in reality than just the mind, the perfect island must exist in reality. He rejects this argument because just because you have an idea about something, does not mean you can define the idea into existence. Anselm responds to this with the notion of the necessary being. He states that "God is that than which no greater can be conceived" making his existence necessary, to be that than which no greater can be conceived he must exist in reality as if he only existed in

The mind he would not be "that than which nothing greater can be conceived" this means God's existence is necessary making him the necessary being. Deleates supported Anselm saying God is a "supremely perfect being", he needs to exist in reality b he has otherwise something could exist that is greater than him. He uses the mountain and a valley to do so a mountain goes with a valley just like God only needs to be exist. He also uses the triangle to say that its sides will add up to 180°, and is unmutable and - incapable of change, God is also unmutable. Also Overall, there are many ideas about the existence of God but not all agree and say that God is "that than which nothing greater can be conceived, the does not prove to <sup>just</sup> because exists in reality. (Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is an example of a script that earned full marks. The material is concise and applied to the question. It is wide ranging and the Gaunilo material is applied to the issue of the nature of existence and how it differs in relation to islands, where it cannot be used to conjure something into reality, and to God where it is part of God's definition and nature.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Stay concise but keep your writing as clear as possible.

## SECTION A

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

1 Explore key ideas about the existence of God in the Ontological Argument.

One key idea of the ontological argument is that God is the greatest possible being that can be conceived. This was proposed by Anselm who aimed to prove God through a priori evidence, this meaning through a ~~description~~ definition. Another key idea about god was

given by Descartes, who stated he is a "Supremely perfect" creature, he used ~~inductive~~ deductive reasoning to prove God is real through this definition he infered God must exist in order to be Supremely perfect.

A final key idea about God is that he ~~is~~ exists in all possible worlds. This idea was brought to light through Plantinga, who suggests if an extremely great being existed in a possible world then it must exist in all possible worlds for it to be called extremely great.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response surveyed a range of ideas about God encompassing existence; it clearly identified these ideas but the material was not fully developed. It was awarded a mark of 6; it just reached Level 3.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Make sure you develop your knowledge sufficiently and apply it to the question.

## Question 2

Assess **two** key weaknesses of the Design Argument for the existence of God. (9)

In the infancy of a new specification it was heartening to see that many candidates had practised this key AO2 skill of 'assessing'. The majority were aware that the bulk of the marks were being awarded for AO2 and there were many who outlined two weaknesses briefly and then systematically assessed the impact of these weaknesses on the argument with clear critical analysis. Some did this through pointing out alternative strengths to the argument or a flaw in the weakness itself. The most common weaknesses were the presence of evil and suffering and Darwin and Dawkins' views on evolution. Many candidates were able to make judgements about these weaknesses and to provide counter arguments. Excellent responses also employed a conclusion that drew their assessment together. Pupils seemed to enjoy the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of this area of the specification.

In weaker responses, most candidates could identify two weaknesses but did not assess the impact of these but rather outlined them. Others spent too long outlining the design argument itself and lost focus on the matter at hand of two weaknesses and their success or otherwise. It is not necessary to outline the argument as the question required an assessment of two weaknesses of it. Some candidates however very ably gave a succinct, 2 line, summary of the key thrust of the argument and then launched straight in to the weaknesses. Some very weak scripts simply described one weakness.

**2 Assess two key weaknesses of the Design Argument for the existence of God.**

The Design Argument is a teleological argument developed by Aquinas and Paley to show that design and beauty in the world is evidence for a creator.

A weakness of this argument comes from David Hume who believed that there is evidence of evil in the world, ~~so~~ and a designer would not want that. Things like natural disasters and predators are evil, so why would God want this in His creation? This is a strong weaknesses as it gives evidence to evil in the world, it also shows that a 'creator' has put evil in the world.

Another key weakness is <sup>also</sup> from Hume. He criticised the watch analogy as He believed that we cannot

compare a piece of machinery to the world that we live in. This is also a strong weakness since it is difficult to compare two completely different things but explain that they have similarities.

However, a strength of the Design Argument is that Swinburne and Tennant show that various things in the world are made especially for humans e.g. food and resources. Therefore, there must be a creator because this could not happen by chance. It is a key strength as it shows that a designer must be present in order to have the world we live in.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response is also at Level 3 but at 8 marks. It has a neat introduction that does not waste too much time. It is clear in its presentation of two weaknesses and offers a view on how strong each weakness is, although in a simple fashion. It then responds to the weaknesses of the argument as a whole by assessing some strengths, albeit rather briefly. It is a rather short answer but there is clear AO2 skill being employed here which puts it into Level 3. A more sophisticated analysis or a response to the individual weaknesses raised in greater depth would have enabled it to reach full marks.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Develop the idea about chance being improbable here perhaps?



## 2 Assess **two** key weaknesses of the Design Argument for the existence of God.

One weakness of the Design Argument is the fact that Darwin proves in the theory of evolution that species evolve naturally to be suited to and able to live in its environment. Since nature can evolve by itself, it does not need a designer and it is possible that God does not exist. This links in with the Epicurean hypothesis, which states that the universe was once chaotic and everything came together by chance to create a universe capable to sustain life.

However, this is rejected by Tennant's Anthropic Principle. He says that the chances of the universe being created as a result of chaos are too small, it cannot be a coincidence that things would come together so perfectly for such a long period of time to be able to sustain intelligent human life. His Aesthetic Principle also argues that we have the capacity within us to appreciate beauty in many different forms, such as art and literature, and this is not necessary for existence. Therefore, this capacity must have been put in us by a designer - God.

A second weakness of the Design Argument is argued by Hume. He argues that ~~the~~ humans could have been created to feel a lesser amount of pleasure rather than feel pain. Pain is unnecessary, so it seems that if human were created, they were created with the purpose of feeling pain. Hume therefore

concludes that either this leads to an immoral God, or that God does not exist.

However, Augustine argues that pain and suffering exist not as a result of God's design, but as a result of humans turning away from God. God created the world a perfect place, and human sin resulted in His design being tainted. Therefore it is not God who is immoral, but humans. The perfect world which God created was destroyed as a result of human action.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This response is clearly in Level 3 and was awarded the top mark of 9. It gets straight to the point, is clear and well structured. It outlines a weakness and assesses it in relation to a counter argument about the strength of the argument or a solution to this challenge. The material is detailed and well marshalled.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

Well done for getting straight to the point and keeping your assessment of each weakness clear. A line or two in conclusion would improve this response even further.

## 2 Assess two key weaknesses of the Design Argument for the existence of God.

Firstly, two philosophers came up with theories for the Design Argument and also came up with analogies of their own to support this. However, although the analogies both make sense and clearly point out the existence of God, there are some weaknesses to them.

William Paley's watchmaker analogy, about how a watch is too complex to have been made by chance, it was criticised as he compares the world to a piece of machinery, where as the world isn't a machine but is organic and so should be cared for something organic.

Thirdly, scientific evidence shows proof of how the world was designed and so Aquinas and Paley's arguments seem out dated and pointless as they can't prove the existence of God itself when science outweighs their theories, scientists have actual theories and evidence.

Finally, there are some strengths to this argument as the world is complex and seems impossible to have been made by chance, and the complexity of the world and the universe seems to difficult to grasp the knowledge of how it was made it must've been made by someone/something very powerful.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This example shows a response that was awarded 4 marks, just into level 2. There is very little material on weaknesses, they are named, and the assessment is a presentation of material about the argument as a whole or the strength of complexity and the improbability of chance although none of these ideas are sufficiently unpacked. This candidate probably knows more than they have presented but this is just into Level 2 response.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Be sure to focus material on the specific demands of the question.

### Question 3

Assess the strengths of Process theodicy. (9)

This question provided the most wide-ranging standard of scripts. There were some candidates who indicated that they had not been taught this part of the specification, for others there was just a blank page.

Good responses were familiar with the ideas of Whitehead and Griffin and how their ideas on creation led them to modify the traditional concept of God – and thus resolving the logical incoherence within the problem of evil. Assessment usually discussed both strengths and weaknesses involved in changing the idea of omnipotence. The most common strengths that were assessed were God's continued omnibenevolence, God suffering alongside humans, the possible overlap with scientific theories such as evolution, and that, according to Process theodicy, God doesn't have the power to stop evil and suffering and so is not to blame. When assessing each of these strengths, candidates often gave counter arguments, for example when discussing God's lack of power to stop evil and suffering, many candidates then explored whether such a God was worthy of worship; this enabled them to assess the success of this particular strength. Many responses also dealt with the issue of whether it is in fact a theodicy and the impact this may have on resolving the problem.

Weaker candidates usually only focused on the modified idea of omnipotence without much more detail – but there was evidence of knowing the topic.

#### 3 Assess the strengths of Process theodicy.

The process theodicy is strong in stating that God is not responsible for natural or moral evil. Whitehead and Griffin state that God is not omnipotent <sup>and</sup> is apart of the world which he created from pre-existing material. This material was flawed and so as a result the world is imperfect bringing about natural ~~and~~ evil. Moreover God started the evolution process but has no control over humans so they are free to ignore him, resulting in moral evil. Whitehead and Griffin further state that God is bound by the same natural laws as humans and so is free from <sup>the</sup> responsibility of evil and suffering. From a scientific standpoint, this theodicy makes sense as there is evidence of evolution from

fossils, so to claim we evolved and weren't created ~~is~~ is a strength, showing that the world was already flawed. This theodicy would therefore appeal to those who don't fully subscribe to the God of classical theism. However to claim it is a theodicy seems contradictory as the word 'theodicy' claims to justify <sup>that</sup> the God of classical theism ~~is~~ can be both omnibenevolent and ~~is~~ omnipotent, with evil simultaneously existing, therefore it is not right to claim this argument as a theodicy. Moreover the argument suggests that since God is not omnipotent, there would be no ~~is~~ evidence of the afterlife existing, so people would be neither punished or rewarded. This seems unfair to those who have suffered and the argument fails to identify a deity to worship which can cause distress to the believer. Lastly since there is no evidence of reward or punishment it makes life pointless as there is no clear purpose to our existence.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response is an example of a script that was awarded full marks. It gets right to the heart of the theory early on and carefully assesses the strengths and weaknesses thereof in a systematic and thorough fashion. It is constructed carefully and exhibits a clear flow in the response. It is also pleasing to see the range of implications considered from the impact of this theory. A clear full marks.

3 Assess the strengths of Process theodicy. <sup>1 weakness</sup> <sup>stumble block</sup> - <sup>jesus suffered</sup>  
← evol. <sup>god is good</sup>

A strength of process theodicy is that it removes the stumbling block of faith. As God cannot stop evil then it is not his fault that evil occurs so he cannot be blamed for this. This means that God is still worthy of worship as he cannot help those who suffer and suffers with them. This is a good strength because it allows for God to remain as a benevolent creator and is removed from evil.

Another strength of process theodicy is that it shows God as a benevolent creator. God cannot control evil but he is good for having made the world rather than not make it. This shows that God is, again, worthy of worship because even though there is evil and suffering within the world he allowed for life and for the earth's existence so should be praised for doing so. This is a good strength as it allows for God to remain separate from evil.

Equally Whitehead's process theodicy is good as it is in line with Christian teachings. Whitehead argues that when we suffer God suffers with us. This ~~is~~ ~~is~~ is supported by the biblical story of Jesus dying on the cross to save ~~us~~ ~~us~~. This is a good strength of the theodicy as it ~~is~~ ~~is~~ makes the theodicy more widely accepted within the

church, giving it more validity.

However a weakness of the theodicy is that it presents God as a weak figure, within the theodicy he is not ~~omnipotent~~ omnipotent (all powerful). Therefore is a limited being worth worship? If God cannot stop evil then it means he is limited and not an almighty being.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response is a mid Level 3 answer that was awarded 8 marks. It gets straight to the heart of the matter by explaining the strengths of the theodicy and it offers clear assessment of the power and validity of these strengths after each one. There is also a consideration of the weakness of the theory despite the assessed and evaluated strengths and this is a useful AO2 approach. It could be improved by tying up the conclusion more tightly, or juxtaposing the weaknesses with the strengths in a more integrated fashion. Despite this, the material presented is a solid level 3 and the candidate carefully earned their 8 marks.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Don't forget to tie up your conclusion really neatly if time.



## Question 4

(a) Explore the key ideas of contingency and necessary existence in the Cosmological Argument. (8)

(b) Analyse the view that the Cosmological Argument fails to prove the existence of God. (20)

a) This question, like q1, is all AO1 marks. High scoring candidates relished the opportunity to present their knowledge and understanding of these two key ideas of the cosmological argument. Good responses showed precise knowledge of the meaning of contingency and necessary existence which was well defined and linked to the argument through the issue of infinite regress. Some excellent answers unpacked the idea of 'aseity'.

In weaker responses, it was evident that some candidates were not clear on the particular definitions and so tended to write generally about the Cosmological Argument and Aquinas instead. Some responses in this part were too short to do the candidates justice as they only wrote a paragraph with little detail or explanation of the terms, and some took 'necessary' to mean 'needed'.

It may be pertinent for teachers to address the issue of timing with their students; some candidates spent too long writing a long introduction and working through Aquinas' Three Ways which was not required to address the question. They obviously wanted to display their detailed subject knowledge but sometimes the material was not directly answering the question. Time is a precious commodity in this exam.

### Question 4b

b) This question saw a wide range of responses. There was very good use of scholarship in the best answers and many answers revealed candidates' detailed knowledge and included analysis of the ideas of philosophers such as Aquinas, William Lane Craig, Bertrand Russell, Copleston, Ockham, Swinburne, Newton, Hume, Dawkins, Darwin, Leibniz and Hawking.

Good responses focused on the failures in the Cosmological Argument, but not simply as a list of problems. The fallacy of composition was often included and used very well, and good answers constantly referred back to the premise in the argument being attacked and whether it could survive these challenges. These answers gave scholarly replies to the problems in the Cosmological Argument, often using the work of Copleston and Swinburne.

Usually the thread of assessment running through the answer was rounded with a conclusion drawing their views back to the question. The strongest scripts were not merely descriptive but analytical throughout. Students analysed each of the reasons, gave examples, counter arguments and made judgements.

Weaker responses just gave a list of objections from Hume, Russell, and/or Dawkins. Some of those students who had not made judgements throughout their essay then missed a further opportunity by only writing a short conclusion (e.g. "it absolutely fails") without showing how the argument had been undermined.

A minority of candidates had answered 4 a) with everything that they knew about cosmology and then struggled to identify material for 4 b). An even smaller group of the weakest scripts showed great confusion and darted from infinite regress, to God existing in the mind and in reality, to Irenaeus; there seemed to be little understanding of which material related to which topic. A small number of students answered 4 b) on a completely different topic from 4 a) - usually giving the Ontological argument but occasionally Design.

## SECTION B

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

- 4 (a) Explore the key ideas of contingency and necessary existence in the Cosmological Argument.

(8)

Contingency and necessary existence is the third of Aquinas' five ways. The idea of this is that all humans in the universe are contingent beings, they all come from someone else and rely on something or someone else for their existence. Aquinas' third way argues that there cannot be infinite regress and therefore there must be a non-contingent and necessary being ~~that caused the rest of the~~ that started the ~~chain~~ chain of contingent beings. The necessary non-contingent being must have caused itself so it is therefore an uncaused cause like mind in Aquinas' second way and an unmoved mover, like explained in Aquinas' first way. The Cosmological argument is an a posteriori argument and is therefore based on evidence, the evidence to support Contingency and necessary existence is the observation that everything that exist, exists because of something else, there must be something that exists but not because of anything else and it must have existed before anything else existed and must have put the first contingent beings or beings on the universe. These are who Christians believe must have been Adam and Eve.

(b) Analyse the view that the Cosmological Argument fails to prove the existence of God.

(20)

there are many arguments for and against the cosmological argument and how successful it is at proving the existence of God. ~~the~~ Bertrand Russell puts forward the idea that the cosmological argument fails to prove the existence of God due to the idea that the universe's existence is just a 'brute fact' and that we ~~the~~ as humans ~~we~~ should just accept the fact that the universe is here and stop trying to figure out how as it is too complex for the human intellect to even understand.

secondly ~~the~~ another argument that the cosmological argument fails to prove the existence of God is that David Hume said "just because we have a mother does not mean that the universe has a mother," this is expressing that we as humans cannot just assume that the universe as a whole works in the cause and effect process like everything else on it.

~~Another~~ ~~Another~~ argues that the cosmological argument fails to prove the existence of God because it is an a posteriori argument and it is also an inductive proof, this means that it is based on empirical evidence may be unreliable and ~~the~~ misunderstood or misinterpreted by human beings, it also makes an

inductive loop, ~~it~~ the premises of the cosmological argument are:

P1 - everything <sup>that exists</sup> has a first cause

P2 - the universe exists

P3 - the universe must have a cause

Conclusion - God is the cause of the universe.

This shows an inductive leap because ~~the~~ God being the cause of the universe is not logically necessary as it could be caused by other things.

~~It~~ Although in some way science can agree with this argument as they both believe in there being a ~~first~~ beginning of the universe, science can also weaken this argument as there is more evidence of the 'big bang theory' than the existence of God.

~~Another~~

Another weakness of this argument is that Aquinas contradicts himself, he states that every being has a first cause but then later on talks about God not having a first cause so if this first statement was to be valid it would have to be edited.

Lastly although there is a lot of evidence to prove that the universe had a first cause and many agree with that, the creator does not have to be the God of Christianity there is no reason for it to be more

lively the God of christianity than any other god  
or even ~~the~~ scientific reasons.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This script scored 8 marks at the top of Level 3 for part a) and 18 marks in the middle of Level 4 for part b). It is clear and nicely developed in a) evidencing good detailed knowledge. The material is focused carefully and accurately on the demands of the question with good use of the Ways being made to explore contingency and necessary existence. Although not particularly long, part b) has a good range of material and it connects ideas together well. It also gives reasoned judgements and uses terminology appropriately. This is clearly a candidate who knows and has used their material well to address the question set. This response is a solid Level 4 response.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Unpack ideas as fully as possible to access the full range of marks.

SECTION B

~~Free~~  
~~necessary~~

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

- 4 (a) Explore the key ideas of contingency and necessary existence in the Cosmological Argument.

(8)

The cosmological argument comes from the word *cosmos* which means existence. It is an a posteriori argument that aims to prove God exists through our knowledge and experience of the world.

It is based on the idea that everything has a cause and it is not possible to list these causes back forever (infinite regress).

It states that all beings are contingent meaning that they rely on something else for existence, nothing can bring itself into existence.

This means that the first cause, the necessary being must exist outside of space and time. The only being who can exist outside of time and space is God so he must exist.

(b) Analyse the view that the Cosmological Argument fails to prove the existence of God.

- D. Hume  
- I. Kant

(20)

Plan: ~~weaken outweigh strength~~ ~~Pl~~ ~~for~~

It can be demonstrated that the weaknesses of the Cosmological Argument far outweigh the strengths proving that the argument fails to prove God's existence.

Firstly, the cosmological argument attempts to explain the ~~ext~~ existence of the whole universe.

Hume states that this is not needed as we should focus on proving why smaller things happen within our world before attempting to explain how the whole universe came into existence. However, someone may disagree with Hume ~~Kant~~ as they feel that proving God created the universe will provide an explanation of why all those little unexplainable things happen.

Secondly, the argument claims that God is the first cause but there is no proof that this is the case. Hume states that even if there is a first cause there is nothing in the argument that proves that first cause is God. A supporter of the argument would ~~agree~~ disagree with Hume by stating that

there is no other being that is powerful enough to be the first cause, nothing in the universe aside from God <sup>possesses</sup> ~~possesses~~ <sup>has</sup> the power to cause the start of a whole universe.

Another reason that the cosmological argument does not prove God exists is that there are other explanations for a first cause. Dawkins would say that there is enough evidence of the big bang theory for it to be a more likely and sufficient explanation of how the ~~the~~ universe began. A supporter of the cosmological argument may disagree as they feel that even though the big bang may appear to have been the first cause God caused the big bang as he exists outside of our knowledge of space and time.

~~A fact~~ Similarly, it does not follow a logical chain of reasoning for God to be the first cause of everything in the universe. This is because there is no proper way to trace everything back to God so God being the first cause must just be an assumption. A supporter of the argument would disagree by saying that it is the only logical explanation <sup>is</sup> for



God to be the first cause as no other being\* is omnipotent, omnibenevolent and omniscient enough to have created the whole universe.

In conclusion, after weighing up the strengths and weaknesses of the argument it is clear that the cosmological argument is not proof of the existence of God.

\* or event.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

For part a) it is only really the second half that addresses the question, the response is rather broad and thin in relevant material. It scored 5 marks in Level 2.

For part b) there is just enough material and AO2 skill in evidence to reach into Level 4 as it is clearly argued, although it does lack some technical language. It was awarded 16 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

It is always a good idea to have a clear conclusion to sum up your argument; adding a few key reasons for the verdict would improve this example.

## Paper Summary

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

- target their material in a way to earn maximum credit for their knowledge
- aim to operate carefully within the time available in the exam and the space available for each question in the answer booklet
- provide detail in a succinct and focused manner and build in clear and developed assessment or analysis to the relevant questions (2, 3, and 4b) but avoid it elsewhere if it detracts from the demands of the question.
- avoid including tangential material in their answers
- focus on the issue of the question only

## **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>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

