



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

**AS
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2
An Introduction to Philosophy of Religion
B120U20-1**

About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- “Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.
2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.
3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two-stage process.

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content.

Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners' marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner.

When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

Awarding no marks to a response

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions [25 marks]</p> <p><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">21-25 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">16-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">11-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">6-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions [25 marks] <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">21-25 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">16-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">11-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">6-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

EDUQAS GCE AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES

COMPONENT 2: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion

SUMMER 2024 MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

Section A

1. (a) Outline Augustinian type theodicies.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Augustinian type theodicies argue that human nature has been completely corrupted at 'The Fall.' Augustine painted a very bleak picture of the human condition.
- This is in complete contrast to the world that God created which was good and completely free from evil. Augustinian type theodicies refer to Genesis which states that 'God saw that it was good.' It then explains evil as the result of the sin of angels and human beings. As evil was not created by God then God cannot be blamed for it, nor should God eliminate it. For Augustine evil is a privation of good, just as blindness is a privation of sight.
- The theodicies argue that the reason for sin is down to angels and humans having free will and through concupiscence (desire, specifically sexual desire), they turn from God and the sinful nature is passed down through the sexual act which perpetuates the sinning. Natural evil is also seen as caused by the Fall.
- As we are all descendants of Adam, the first man, we are also guilty of Adam's sin. We were with Adam when he ate the apple, so his sin is our sin, his guilt is our guilt and likewise we deserve to be punished. 'All evil is either sin or the punishment for sin.' We fully deserve all evil that befalls us whether that has been inflicted by humans or nature as we were 'seminally present' in Adam.
- Augustine says that it is better to bring good out of evil than to not permit evil. Human understanding of evil is partial as we cannot see the whole picture, which God can. God knows that there is a purpose for evil in the world. In fact, Adam's sin was a *felix culpa*, a happy mistake, as without it then Jesus would not have been sent to redeem humanity.
- Jesus' sacrifice allowed for atonement. The relationship which was ruined at 'The Fall' was put right again by his death. This allows for humans to choose to accept Jesus and reach heaven. We are all guilty so we should all be punished. God is a fair God but also a forgiving one.
- Alvin Plantinga may be referred to in this context with his reference to non-human input in the decay and destruction of the natural world.
- Reference could be made to other scholars who discuss the free-will defence, such as Swinburne who champions the idea that it is vital that God gives humans free-will in order for the world we live in to be a real one.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) 'Augustinian type theodicies are irrelevant in the 21st Century.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- This question is asking for a response to a specific issue, that is the relevance of such theodicies today. For the higher Bands candidates should not just be listing strengths and weaknesses of this type of theodicy. These may well be included but credit should be given when these points are related to the 21st century.
- One line of argument that supports the statement is that Augustinian type theodicies are based upon outdated biology. It is widely accepted that we are not biologically related to Adam. It may be debated therefore whether it is justifiable that humans are punished for Adam's sin. The theodicy runs contrary to our current scientific worldview which has humanity evolving to an improved state (the opposite of the Augustinian type view.)
- Another area supporting the statement might focus on the basis of the theodicy – i.e. the fact that it is based on a literal interpretation of the stories of Creation and The Fall. Today these accounts are generally deemed to be myths and so due to an incorrect interpretation of scripture these stories are not factual accounts. But, the literal truth of Creation and the Fall may be accepted by some believers today, making such theodicies consistent with tradition.
- A line of argument could argue that our logical, empirical world cannot accept the many inconsistencies inherent in the theodicy. The idea that evil came from perfection makes no sense whatsoever. Also, the idea that Hell was part of the created order is inconsistent with a perfect world. This lack of rational thought means the theodicy is irrelevant today.
- The concepts of Hell and fallen angels are not accepted concepts in today's world. The theodicy is reliant on a number of things that we reject today for its credibility. Indeed, the concepts of Hell and the existence of an omnibenevolent God are contradictory concepts.
- However, many would argue that Augustinian type theodicies, with their emphasis on an omnibenevolent God, is wholly relevant today as this is clearly a concept that would be accepted by Christians as being compatible with the traditional view of the God of Classical Theism. The same applies to the concepts of God as a just God and to God as a merciful God.
- The idea of humans being depraved could be seen to be personified in many human beings throughout history and in today's world. Today humans carry out the most atrocious acts which would lead many to say that they are in bondage to sin.
- It also makes logical sense (hence fits with today's worldview) that evil is not a substance, it is not 'a thing' in itself; it is merely the absence of good. It is a most relevant concept to say that there is a gap between what there is and what there ought to be in the behaviour of humans and in acts of nature. Hence the theodicy is relevant.
- The theodicy is relevant when it gives humans responsibility for sinning as we see this at work in our justice system today. Hence the 'workings' of the theodicy coincide with modern expectations.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

2. (a) Explain what is meant by the problem of evil.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may refer to the logical problem of evil. That is that the existence of evil alongside the characteristics of omnipotence and omnibenevolence ascribed to the God of Classical Theism is illogical. All three things cannot exist simultaneously. They may refer to Epicurus, 'Either God wants to abolish evil.....impotent...wicked....why is there evil?' and/or to Mackie's 'Inconsistent Triad'. If God loves his creation he would not want it to suffer, it does suffer, and therefore God must not be powerful enough to stop the evil. If God is powerful enough to stop the evil, he clearly does not so either does not love creation enough to stop evil or is apathetic to its existence.
- It may be noted that it is possible to remove one of these criteria. But doing so would not actually be solving the problem at all. It would either deny the reality of evil which is nonsense or it would remove a necessary quality of God, hence being unacceptable to most.
- Reference may be made to moral and natural evil with examples. Credit will be given when candidates use these types of evil to illustrate the specific problem that their existence causes to a belief in a God. They may point out that for non-theistic religions there is no 'problem' as such.
- Candidates may also refer to the evidential problem of evil. This could include reference to Rowe, who raises the problem of intense human and animal suffering. Rowe would accept that some suffering is necessary and beneficial but a wholly good God would not inflict such large amounts of pointless suffering on either humans or the animal kingdom. This is of no benefit.
- Candidates may also refer to Gregory Paul who raises the problem of the statistical evidence for the large-scale premature deaths that have occurred. This covers all deaths that have happened as a result of either moral or natural evil before a person has reached their 'ripe' age. This includes genocide, murder, teenage illness and so on. The premature death of anyone is abhorrent, particularly those of innocent children. They have not committed any sin nor have they had the opportunity to make any conscious decisions. Therefore, this evidence poses a massive problem for the belief in an omnipotent and omnibenevolent God.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **'Irenaeus' theodicy does not succeed in defending the God of Classical Theism.'**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates might be expected to discuss the characteristics of the God of Classical Theism in order to evaluate whether the Irenaean theodicy defends this God.
- With regard to Irenaeus, it could be said that this type of theodicy reflects our understanding of evolution and is therefore successful for that reason. The God of Classical Theism is one who directs the process of evolution as this God is omnipotent.
- However, the authenticity of his Biblical references may be called into question and may therefore suggest that his theodicy is unsuccessful. If humans were not made in the image of God, then the development to likeness suggested is also called into question.
- For some, God's omnibenevolence squares with the idea of universal salvation. However for others this is the weakness of the theodicy. It is an unjust concept and does not square with a fair God.
- An omnibenevolent God would give human beings free will and this can show that Irenaeus' theodicy does defend the God of Classical Theism.
- It may well be true that some suffering does allow humans to develop morally; it does generate characteristics of fortitude and courage. However others do not develop as a result of suffering. It breaks them rather than developing them. Candidates can use this material to evaluate whether this aligns with the God of Classical Theism.
- The suggestion that the theodicy relies on there being an after-life can be used both as a success and as a weakness in terms of defending God. If there is an after-life, it may succeed but if there isn't then it seems that the theodicy may fail to defend the God of Classical Theism.
- It would be acceptable for candidates to make some reference to Augustinian type theodicies by way of evaluating the relative success of the defence of Irenaeus. However, the primary focus should not be shifted from the question in order to attain the higher Bands.
- For example, in Augustinian types it might be suggested that God's omnibenevolence is not successfully defended as only some are saved. However, others would argue that this very fact emphasises God's benevolence.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Section B

3. (a) **Examine the nature of religious experience with reference to (i) visions and (ii) conversion.**

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- It can be claimed that God is experienced beyond ordinary empirical evidence, through what may be known as a religious experience. It can be individual or corporate. They are believed to transmit some information either about the nature of the divine or about the nature of reality.
- Visions can be categorised in many ways, but the usual categories are sensory, intellectual and dreams. A vision is a message from God and can be supported by scriptural reference (e.g. Moses in Exodus 3). This possibility is supported by wide personal testimony – Lourdes, Fatima and by Tillich's feeling of 'ultimate concern'.
- However, the categorisation of visions is not clear-cut. It is better to think of it as a prism or the colours of a rainbow. One vision can be comprised of a number of aspects which candidates could exemplify.
- In terms of a sensory vision, an external figure may reveal previously unknown information to the recipient. This may involve an intellectual vision. These generally occur when the recipient is in a conscious state. However, visions involving dreams will occur when the person is in an unconscious state. This too will transmit information to the recipient. Common to most are feelings of great joy, exultation and intellectual illumination, which is impossible to describe, a sense of reality and truth, what Otto would call the 'otherness' of God. Alternatively, they may be ineffable and beyond human expression.
- Visions often require prayer, interpretation and response from the experiencer – for example, a change of lifestyle. Noted mystics and visionaries include St Teresa and Julian of Norwich.
- Sensory visions can be group visions or individual visions. Some of these visions are corporeal in nature (physical nature) and others are non-corporeal. At times corporeal figures can only be seen by certain people.
- Conversion is the change in direction of a life. Conversion can be individual, for example St. Paul or communal, for example at Pentecost, the conversion of the disciples in the Book of Acts. It can involve a change in direction from theism to atheism, atheism to theism (St. Augustine) or a conversion from one religious tradition to another.
- There are a variety of component parts to the description of conversion that candidates could refer to as well as individual and communal. Conversion can be sudden, an unexpected event that happens 'out of the blue'. However, conversion can also be gradual, where a person undergoes almost a 'drip-feed' set of experiences that culminates in conversion.
- The conversion generally brings about a feeling of renewal where the person may describe a feeling of being 'born again' or of becoming a new person. This conversion may be as a result of their own choice to freely surrender themselves to the experience. Others describe being 'taken' by the experience where they are completely passive, with the experience happening to them.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **‘Visions are the least valid type of religious experience in communicating religious teachings and beliefs.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may evaluate the validity of visions as ways of communicating religious teachings and beliefs by comparing validity with other types of religious experience such as prayer and mysticism. A ‘worked’ example concerning conversion can be seen below.
- They may suggest that all experiences are a valid means of communicating teaching and practice or may select one or more than one type of religious experience as having more validity in this respect. For example, they may say that visions are the most effective way of communicating teaching and belief as visions are indeed the foundations of many religious beliefs and teachings. A pertinent example may be St. Peter’s vision of a blanket containing all sorts of creatures descending. This communicated the belief and teaching of Jews being able to eat with Gentiles.
- However, others may suggest that the results of claimed visions are so diverse and contradictory that they would deem those visions to be less than effective ways of communicating anything clear.
- Candidates may focus part of their response on other types of religious experience and the effectiveness of that experience in communicating religious belief and practice. Conversion could have a visible outcome as William James would put it ‘the fruits’ of the experience are that it transforms a person’s life. Teachings and beliefs could then be argued to be communicated through this conversion experience.
- Some may argue that visions are delusional and ‘conversion’ experiences have been driven by some psychological need. In this sense neither can communicate religious teaching and/or belief as they do not stem from any objective reality.
- However, some would cite the sheer weight of testimony in support of visions (conversion or other types of religious experience) as a means of communicating religious teaching and belief. There is the encouragement of the sheer weight of testimony in support and the claims of supporters to have heard and/ or experienced God and had changed lives.
- Moreover, if God exists, these would surely be the ways in which God might choose to communicate religious teachings and belief?
- However, a problem arises due to the nature of some types of religious experience. That is that they are ineffable. If a person, who claims to have experienced a vision for example, cannot describe anything about that experience, then how can they communicate anything regarding belief and/or teaching?
- However, there are examples of those that perhaps could not initially vocalise the experience but later on could. That experience was then found to be completely packed with key religious teachings and belief or a way forward for particular individuals. St. Paul was initially struck dumb but then vocalised key teachings. C.S. Lewis became convinced that Jesus was the Son of God as the result of a conversion experience; hence a key belief was communicated via conversion.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

4. (a) **Outline teleological arguments with reference to (i) Aquinas' Fifth Way and (ii) Tennant's anthropic argument.**

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

Aquinas

- Aquinas accepts this as an 'a posteriori' argument. That is, it is inductive and based on empirical experience. It has a basis in probability rather than proof. His teleological argument is the Fifth of his Five Ways in proving God's existence, 'from the governance of things.'
- He claims that certain aspects of the universe display evidence of being deliberately designed, for instance, the structure of eyes, hands and the movement of the planets are all proof that the universe is intelligently designed. Aquinas' Fifth Way looks at the regularity of action and order. That is, design qua regularity and design qua purpose. The fact that non-intelligent matter achieves a purpose/end implies an intelligent designer. He argues that beneficial order could not have happened by chance. Many objects do not have the intelligence to work towards an end or final purpose therefore they must be guided to it by something with intelligence. Whatever lacks intelligence cannot move towards an end unless directed by a being endowed with intelligence. This is not only the case for things within the universe but also applies to the universe itself.
- Aquinas provides an analogy of an archer and an arrow. The arrow is unintelligent and would not reach its target unless it is directed by a being with intelligence, the archer. It is important that candidates then relate this to the workings of God and the universe.

Tennant

- The 'anthropic argument' also highlights intelligent design because of the universe's suitability for human life. By observing the universe with its very precise nature and of all that is contained within it, one can induce that it was deliberately designed to support and develop intelligent life. This universe contains an ideal set of circumstances for humans to exist. Life can be sustained, and the universe is open to analysis. The process of evolution which leads to human life seems to be a deliberate mechanism. It is as if God created the conditions necessary for evolution to occur. In other words, an intelligent, divine designer has planned 'all of this' and has embedded these plans into the very fabric of the universe.
- Nature seems to plan in advance for the needs of animals and humans. This cannot be accounted for by physical laws alone. Intricate relationships found in science relating to the development of living organisms show that things cannot have just happened – it looks like the presence of overall direction, working together for our benefit, just as if the universe 'knew that we were coming.'

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) ‘Challenges to teleological arguments for God’s existence are effective.’

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates need to evaluate whether the various challenges made to teleological arguments render the teleological arguments as ineffective. There are a number of teleological arguments so expect more than one to be referred to.
- One area to consider may be the concept of proof. Teleological arguments are inductive and so can only lead to probabilities. It is valid deductive arguments that offer proof. Therefore teleological arguments may be relatively weak in their efficacy.
- A line of argument is to show that teleological arguments are flawed. For instance if Paley’s argument is considered reference to Hume’s criticisms and others, may be given. There is the issue of the use of an unsound analogy – our world is not like a machine, it is more organic than mechanical. Similar effects do not necessarily imply similar causes. The analogy leads to a non-moral God because of the existence of natural evil. It suggests that the designer is evil or weak.
- Further analysis may focus on other explanations for apparent order, especially Darwin and the theory of evolution. This could be seen to explain the mechanism for order. This can then suggest that teleological arguments pointing to a divine designer of the universe is ineffective.
- However, the theory that evolution alone can explain human life can be shown to be an ineffective challenge. The anthropic principle suggests that the universe provides us with what we need to survive and is capable of being rationally analysed by humans. This is due to a designer God working within the evolutionary process in order for life to be sustained. Thus, evolution alone cannot explain life.
- In addition, if survival of the fittest were true then we would have no need for the appreciation of beauty, art, music and so on. However, we clearly do appreciate these things so an omnibenevolent God designed humans in such a way that we would appreciate beauty. God wants humans to not only survive but also to enjoy the world (the aesthetic argument.)
- There is much contemporary support for design. There is intelligent design incorporating irreducible complexity. Many support the anthropic principle such as Polkinghorne who argues that God continues to create and to sustain. P. Davies says that the universe being as it is without divine intelligence behind it is virtually impossible. These arguments may overwhelm the challenges to teleological arguments.
- In response, it could be said that design is something that our mind imposes on the universe and actually the universe is completely chaotic. Therefore, with no design there is no need to infer a designer.
- It could also be argued that cosmological or ontological arguments are more or less effective than teleological arguments. It should be noted though that this is certainly not the focus of the question so credit should be minimal for only this type of approach.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

5. (a) Outline the ontological arguments of (i) St. Anselm and (ii) Descartes.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- The ontological argument is a deductive argument, that is, the process of reasoning from one or more statements to a logical conclusion. It is 'a priori' based on theoretical deduction rather than from observation or experience.
- *Candidates are asked to outline 'ontological arguments' and so one of Proslogion 2 and 3 from Anselm and Descartes' 'existence as perfection' would still answer the full demands of the question. Both scholars are expected in an answer, but not necessarily even coverage.*

St. Anselm:

- The ontological argument can be found in Anselm's Proslogion, and it is important to look at his definition of God from Chapter 2. This definition of God is of 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived'. Anselm believed in God already and was trying to show how self-evident God's existence was to him. Indeed, for him, to accept the definition of God and then to deny God's existence would be absurd and self-contradictory.
- Anselm referred to 'the fool' in Psalm 14 who denies the existence of God. The idea is that the very definition of God means something that must exist in reality and not only in mind. Even the fool accepts that God exists in the mind if it is only to reject God. If God is the greatest imaginable then he must exist separately from people's imaginations. He must exist in reality. If he exists only as a concept, then a greater being could be imagined. This builds on his earlier premise that existence in the mind and in reality is greater than existence purely in the mind. This other being would be greater than a God that exists only in the mind as this other being would also have the greatness of existing in reality. This cannot be the case (Proslogion 2)
- Anselm's second form of the argument is found in Proslogion 3. God's non-existence is a logical impossibility. Existence has a limit in that it is also possible for non-existence. It is impossible to think of 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived' as not-existing in the first instance. 'A being than which nothing greater can be conceived' must exist because 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived' cannot be thought of as not-existing as this would mean that there exists a 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived' for which it is possible to not-exist but also a greater 'being than which nothing greater can be conceived' (which **cannot** not exist) and this is clearly illogical. Therefore, to be 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived' God must be a being that **cannot** not exist. This being, by very nature of being 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived' must be the only being of its kind, that is, unique and 'the highest degree' of existence.

Descartes:

- Descartes saw the ontological argument as deductive and *a priori*, based on theoretical deduction rather than observation or experience. His definition of God was one of a 'supremely perfect being.' He saw existence as a quality that integrally belonged to God in the same way that three angles make a triangle or as mountain entails a valley. For God, existence is a predicate, God's defining predicate. One cannot conceive of a supremely perfect being without existence.
- Descartes argued that, as he could conceive of his own existence, he could also conceive of the existence of the perfect being. Descartes offered his own form of the argument; God, a supremely perfect being, has all perfections. Existence is a perfection. Therefore God, a supremely being, exists.
- In 'Meditation 5', Descartes argued that there were some qualities that an object necessarily and or else it would not be that object. Therefore existence cannot be separated from the concept of God.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **‘Ontological arguments are more persuasive than teleological arguments for God’s existence.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- For the higher Bands, expect candidates to perform a comparative evaluation of ontological and teleological arguments, rather than stand-alone evaluations of the two.
- It is permissible to evaluate the persuasiveness of both *a priori* and *a posteriori* arguments, but the focus lies within the material relating specifically to teleological and ontological arguments rather than to *a priori* and *a posteriori* themselves.
- Ontological arguments are regarded as persuasive because they are ‘*a priori*’ arguments and a deductive proof with a logically inescapable conclusion. They present a logically necessary conclusion once the premises are shown to follow on successively in a coherent fashion. This is attractive to believers of theistic religions, because for them the existence of God is self-evident. This is a better line of argumentation than inductive, *a posteriori* proofs which only lead to a possible conclusion.
- However, supporters of teleological arguments may argue otherwise. It can be said that inductive arguments, although they do not offer definitive ‘proof’, are far more reliable than deductive arguments as they are based on experience and evidence. Teleological arguments in this way are more persuasive.
- Teleological arguments rest on sound assumptions including the idea that all things in the Universe show signs of intricate design and so need a designer. This is based on evidence that is available for all to see and therefore this is a persuasive aspect of teleological arguments.
- But there are unpersuasive aspects to teleological arguments. The arguments rest on the jump from ‘designer’ to the ‘God of Classical Theism.’ This is unwarranted. There is also considerable evidence against design in the Universe such as natural disaster. This may suggest that looking for alternative arguments for God’s existence may be more productive and more persuasive.
- However teleological arguments can align themselves to current trends in Science and are accepted by many contemporary Scientists. The Anthropic Principle and Intelligent Design can add to the persuasiveness of teleological arguments today.
- A further objection to the persuasiveness of teleological arguments may be that one cannot move from part to whole. That is, just because things in the universe are designed this does not mean that the Universe as a whole needs a designer (the fallacy of composition.)
- Regarding ontological arguments, they do seem to be logical in their assertion that we cannot explain the concept of God properly without concluding that he exists. That is, if one understands the definition of God then it will be an obvious deduction that God does indeed possess the property of existence. To deny this would be tantamount to being a fool. Such arguments are genius in their linguistic and logical persuasion and may provide better arguments for God’s existence than teleological argument which rely on evidence which may be misguided.
- However, there is a powerful and obvious conclusion that you cannot define something into existence. Those who disregard it cite the effectiveness of counter-claims e.g. Gaunilo’s ‘greatest island’ or Kant’s use of examples such as thalers, mountain and valley and a triangle.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.