

Theme 1: Arguments for the existence of God – inductive, AS

<b>'Inductive arguments for God's existence are persuasive.'</b>	
<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<b>'The Kalam cosmological argument is convincing.'</b>	
<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<b>'The cosmological/teleological argument for God's existence is effective.'</b>	
<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Cosmological/teleological arguments are persuasive in the 21st Century.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Challenges to the cosmological/teleological argument are effective.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Scientific explanations are more persuasive than philosophical explanations for the universe's existence.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

Theme 1: Arguments for the existence of God – deductive, AS

<b>'A priori arguments for God's existence are persuasive.'</b>	
<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<b>'Different religious views on the nature of God impact on arguments for God.'</b>	
<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<b>'Ontological argument for God's existence are effective.'</b>	
<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'The ontological argument is more persuasive than the cosmological/teleological arguments for God's existence.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'The challenges to the ontological argument for God's existence are effective.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Objections to the ontological argument are persuasive.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

Theme 2: Challenges to religious belief - the problem of evil and suffering, AS

‘The classical form of the problem of evil is a problem.’	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

‘Modern problem of evil arguments are effective in proving God's nonexistence.’	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

‘Augustinian type theodicies are relevant in the 21st Century.’	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'Augustine's theodicy succeeds as a defence of the God of Classical Theism.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'Irenaean type theodicies are credible in the 21st Century.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'Irenaeus's theodicy succeeds as a defence of the God of Classical Theism.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

Theme 2: Challenges - Religious belief as a product of the human mind, Year 2

<b>'Religious belief can be considered a neurosis.'</b>	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<b>'Freud's explanation of religious belief is adequate.'</b>	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<b>'Jung was more positive than Freud about the idea of God.'</b>	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Empirical approaches are effective as critiques of Jungian views on religion.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Atheistic arguments are successful against religious belief.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Religious responses to New Atheism have been successful.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>



Theme 3: Religious Experience, AS

<i>'The impact of religious experience on belief and practice is significant.'</i>	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<i>'Different types of religious experience can be accepted as equally valid in communicating religious teachings and beliefs.'</i>	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

<i>'James' four characteristics in defining mystical experience are adequate.'</i>	
FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Otto's definition of 'numinous' is adequate.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'The challenges to religious experience are valid.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Franks-Davis's different challenges are persuasive.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

### Theme 3: Religious Experience, Year 2

*'The impact of religious experience on belief and practice is significant.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'Religious communities are entirely dependent on religious experiences.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'It is good to have different definitions of miracles.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'The different definitions of miracles are contradictory.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>

**'Challenges to belief in miracles are effective.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>

**'Swinburne's responses to Hume can be accepted as valid.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>

Theme 4: Religious language, Year 2

*'The solutions presented by religious philosophers for the inherent problems of using religious language are convincing.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'The exclusive context of religious belief gives meaning to religious language.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'Arguments asserting the meaningfulness of religious language are persuasive.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Logical Positivism should be accepted as providing a valid criterion for meaning in the use of language.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'The challenges to Logical Positivism provide convincing arguments to nonreligious believers.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Non-cognitive interpretations are valid responses to the challenges to the meaning of religious language.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

### Theme 4: Religious language, Year 2

*'The terms non-cognitive, analogical and mythical are effective as solutions to the problems of religious language.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'Religious language issues are relevant in the 21st Century.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

*'Language games provide a suitable way of resolving the problems of religious language.'*

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'Symbolic language can be agreed as having adequate meaning as a form of language.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'The works of Randall and Tillich provide a suitable counter-challenge to Logical Positivism.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>

**'The strengths of language games outweigh the weaknesses.'**

FOR	AGAINST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul>



